

A N  
A N S W E R  
T O T H E  
C O M P I L E R  
O F T H E  
Nubes Testium;

Wherein is shewn

That ANTIQUITY (in relation to the  
Points of Controversie set down by Him)  
did not for the first five hundred years  
Believe, Teach or Practise,

As the Church of *Rome* doth at present  
Believe, Teach and Practise.

Together with a Vindication of the  
VETERES VINDICATI

From the late weak and disingenuous Attempts  
Of the Author of

Transubstantiation Defended,

By the Author of the Answer to Mr. *Sclater* of *Putney*.

L O N D O N, Printed for *Henry Mortlock* at the *Phoenix*  
in *St. Paul's Church-yard*. 1688.

AN  
ANSWER  
TO THE  
COMPLAINT  
OF THE  
Nobles Testimony

THE  
COMMISSIONERS  
OF THE  
LANDS  
AND  
REVENUE  
OFFICE  
IN  
ANSWER  
TO THE  
COMPLAINT  
OF THE  
Nobles Testimony





# T H E Introduction.

**W**Hen I first entertained the thoughts of answering this Collection of Nubes Testium, I must confess that I could not begin the doing it without some awe, and dread of the Author thereof: I was so affraid of encountering with a man of those parts and learning he was said to be of, that I was for leaving the answering his book to men of equal parts and learning: And I was very fearful of meddling with the man who wrote the best book that ever was writ, or ever would be written for their cause (as a Learned young Squire was pleased to say of his Papist Misrepresented and Represented) not knowing but this Nubes Testium might be the Second best book in the world, and therefore too gigantick for me to grapple with.

But I took courage notwithstanding such a Character of the Author, and lookt upon the Squires Saying as one of his Complements to his New Church, and that Honour and Hopes were things so surprizing and dazeling to his Worship, that 'tis no wonder they made him speak something becoming his New Great self: for as to that Book of Representations and Misrepresentations every body saw,

but those who were resolved to wink hard, that his excellent Answerer hath sufficiently exposed that book, and shewn how much more of paint and cunning than of Solidity and Sincerity was to be seen in it; and for this Book under my hands I question not but that I have let the Reader see, that it is the true second part of the Representor, who hath served Antiquity and the Primitive Fathers in this Nubes just as he did in his other book the Church of England, and her present or late Writers.

For the Matter and Authorities out of which this book is made up; One would have believed that a Man who had presented the world with so large a Collection, was very conversant in those Fathers he here makes use of; and for my part I should have had such an opinion of him, could he but have kept his own Council a little better, and not have brag'd that the Latin of his Authorities was out of

(a) Preface  
to Nubes Testi-  
um near  
the end of  
it.

(a) such Editions as are most authentick: But when I came to examine things, I quickly perceived. (to say no worse of it) that this Collector said more than he knew, since the present French Historian Natalis Alexandre, out of whom this whole Nubes Testium (excepting a very few passages) is wholly stole, does not acquaint his Reader, that I can observe, what Editions of the Fathers he makes use of: And reason good, since I believe he saw very little more than our Compiler the Fathers themselves, but did very fairly take upon trust: And which is more F. Alexandre tells his Reader in his Preface to his first volume that he makes use of Christophersons Translation of Eusebius's History, which the Men of this age I am sure do not believe to be the most Authentick; If our Compiler (for he that steals a whole book without once mentioning whence he had it, deserves no better a title) of the Nubes Testium do, there is no help for it.

It was by remembering this last passage in Natalis's Preface, and comparing it with our Compilers Brag about his Editions of the Fathers being the most authentick, that I came to discover our Compilers haunts, and found him to be the greatest Plagiary that has appeared. (I believe) on the Stage in these times.

*I will not trouble my self to prove this charge upon him here, since I do it abundantly in my Answer it self, where I follow him from passage to passage, and shew not only the book, but the very pages in Natalis Alexandre from whence he steals.*

*But I have a much worse thing to lay to our Compilers charge here, than the Ungrateful Plagium it self, and it is, That he hath stole this Nubes Testium out of an Author, every one of whose Volumes, ( that are made use of by our Compiler ) had been condemned to the flames two years before, and forbidden by the supreme Authority in this Church.*

*I cannot but look upon this as a great instance of our Compilers Sincerity: In his Papist Misrepresented and Represented He gives this Character of his Papist, That he is one who is ready to behave (b) himself towards his Chief Pastor [ the Pope ] with all Reverence and submission, never scrupling to receive his Decrees and Definitions, such as are issued forth by his Authority with all their due Circumstances, and according to the Law in the Concern of the whole Flock: and this, whether He [ the Pope ] has the Assistance of a Divine Infallibility or no, &c.*

(b) Papist  
Misrepr. &  
Repr. c. 18.  
p. 22. -

*Here our Compiler did not characterize himself, nor is this I am sure any Picture of his, for notwithstanding all this smooth discourse in that Chapter about the Pope, He does in this book all directly contrary to it; F. Alexandre's books to the twelfth Century inclusively were ordered to be examined, and the Pope committed the examination of them to some of his Cardinals joining with them some peculiar Divines, who together did agree unanimously that F. Alexandre's books deserved to be prohibited and condemned; upon this the Pope did not only by his Breve condemn those Books, but did forbid the keeping as well as reading of them, did inhibit all the faithful of what condition or state soever; under the pain of excommunication immediately incurred the Printing, TRANSCRIBING, READING or USING ALL or ANY of THOSE*

THOSE BOOKS: and yet our Compiler had the Courage, notwithstanding the Excommunication denounced, and incurred by him, not only to KEEP and TO READ, but to PRINT, TO TRANSCRIBE and TO MAKE USE OF SOME OF THOSE CONDEMNED BOOKS.

I cannot see how our Compiler will answer this his contempt: and this seems to be a tryal of skil betwixt the Pope and Him about Infallibility; if the Pope be Infallible (as I believe our Compiler used to think (c) him) then our Compiler is in a miserable condition; but if our Compiler be the Infallible, (as He had

(c) See for this his 1<sup>st</sup> chap. concerning the Pope in his *Papist Misperf.* and *Repris.*

need to be that acted thus point-blank against the Pope's mature and most Solemn Decree) then the Pope himself is in a very simple Condition; I leave the Decision of the Point to the Romish Priests in England, who confess our Compiler.

But least our Compiler should evade the severe charge laid against him, by pretending all this is but a dream and an Invention of us Protestants; and that I may gratify the Curiosity of those who never heard of, or saw this severe Breve against Natalis Alexandre, I will here put it down, and translate it so as that my English Reader may understand it also.

INNOCENTIUS P. P. XI. ad perpetuam Rei memoriam.

INNOCENT the Eleventh, POPE, for the PERPETUAL MEMORY OF THE THING.

*Cum in Lucem prodierint quidam libri, Autore fratre Natali Alexandre, Ordinis Prædicatorum Parisiis impressi, videlicet alii in sexdecim volumina distributi & à primo usque ad duodecesimum seculum inclusive editi, sub titulo, Selecta Historia Ecclesiasticæ capita, & in loca ejusdem insigniora, Dissertationes Historiæ, Chronologiæ, Criticæ, Dogmaticæ; alii vero in quatuor opuscula divisi sub Titulis, Summa S. Thomæ vindicata: Dissertationum Ecclesiasticarum Tr. 2<sup>a</sup>, &c. Dissertatio*

Whereas certain Books have been published, the Author *Br. Natalis Alexandre* a Dominican, printed at *Paris*; some of which divided into sixteen Volumes [deducing the History of the Church] from the first to the twelfth Century inclusively are put forth under the Title of *Select Heads of Ecclesiastical History, with Historical, Chronological, Critical and Dogmatical Dissertations*

*sertations upon the more famous parts thereof; others divided into four Tracts under the Titles of Sr. Thomas's Summes vindicated, a Triade of Ecclesiastical Dissertations, &c. a Polemical Dissertation concerning Sacramental Confession, &c. an Animadversion upon Launoy's Observations about Simony.* Having made choice of many of our Reverend Brethren the Cardinals, together with some other Doctors in Divinity for the examination of the said Books, and having heard, and thoroughly examined the said Divines Opinions, they did unanimously give their Judgment, that all the above-named Books (if it seemed good to us) should be prohibited and condemned. Hereupon being desirous to discharge carefully that Pastoral charge committed to us by our Lord, as well by the Counsel of the said Cardinals, as of our own proper motion and certain knowledge and mature deliberation, and also by the PLENTITUDE OF APOSTOLICAL POWER We do DAMN and REPROBATE by virtue of these presents ALL and EVERY of the above-named Books, and we do forbid their being either READ or KEPT, and we do altogether inhibit ALL and EVERY of the FAITHFUL of what condition or quality soever, the PRINTING, TRANSCRIBING, READING, or USE of all and EVERY of the said Books, under Pain of Excommunication to be incurred ipso facto WITHOUT ANY OTHER DECLARATION

(a)

Polemica de Confessione Sacramentali, &c. contra Launoyanos circa Simoniam observationes Animadversio, Quamplures autem ex Venerabilibus fratribus nostris S. R. E. Cardinalibus ad eundem librorum examen una cum nonnullis in Sacra Theologia Magistris à nobis specialiter electis, auditis doctorum Theologorum, matureque discussis sententiis, omnes libros prædictos, (si ita NOBIS placeret) prohibendos & condemnandos esse unanimi consensu censuerunt: Hinc est quod nos creditum nobis à Domino pastoralis curæ atque vigilantie munus quantum nobis ex alto concessit, salubriter exequi cupientes, de eorundem Cardinalium Consilio, ac etiam motu proprio & ex certâ scientiâ ac matura deliberatione nostra, deque APOSTOLICÆ POTESTATIS PLENITUDINE omnes singulos libros supradictos tenore præsentium damnamus & reprobamus, ac LEGI seu RETINERI prohibemus, ipsorumque librorum OMNIUM & SINGULORUM Impressionem, DESCRIPTIONEM, LECTONEM & USUM OMNIBUS & SINGULIS Christi Fidelibus etiam specifica, & individua mentione & expressione dignis, SUB PENA EXCOMMUNICATIONIS per contrafacientes ipso facto ABSQUE ALIA DECLARATIONE INCURRENDA, à quâ nemo à quoquam præterquam à Nobis, seu Romano Pontifice pro tempore existente, nisi in mortis articulo constitutus absolutionis beneficium valeat obtinere, omnino interdiciamus. Volentes & Apostolica Autoritate mandantes, ut quicumque libros prædictos, vel eorum aliquam penes se habuerint, illos seu illum statim atque presentes literæ eis innoverint, teneantur tradere atque consignare locorum Ordinariis, vel hereticæ pravitatis Inquisitoribus, qui exemplaria sibi sic tradita illico flammis abolerent, in contrarium facientibus non obstantibus quibuscunque. Ut autem iste

RATION



*istæ præsentæ Litere omnibus facilius innotescant, nec quisquam illarum ignorantiam allegare possit, Volumus & Auctoritate prædictâ decernimus illas ad varias Basilicæ, Principis Apostolorum ac Cancellariæ Apostolicæ, &c. Datum Romæ apud Sanctum Petrum sub Anno Piscatoris die decimo Julii 1684. Pontificatus nostri anno octavo, &c. In the Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres for the month of October 1684. p. 260, 261, &c.*

RATION by any that act contrary to this our Decree, who shall not be absolved (except AT THE POINT OF DEATH) by any person besides our self, and the Pope of Rome for the time being. And We will, and command by our Apostolick Authority, that if any persons have all or any of those said Books in their custody, they shall deliver and resign up those Books,

or that Book, as soon as these our present Letters shall be made known to them, unto the Ordinaries of the places [*where they live,*] or to the Inquisitors, who are to take care that the Copies so delivered up to them be immediately condemned to the flames, any Canon or Custom to the contrary notwithstanding. And that these our present Letters may more easily come to the knowledge of all persons, and none may pretend ignorance of them, We will and decree by our Apostolick Authority, that these Letters be affixed to the Doors of the Church of St. Peter, and of the Apostolick Chancery, &c. [*the rest concerns onely the securing of this publick notice.*] Given at Rome at St. Peters under the Seal of the Fisher, the tenth day of July 1684. being the eighth year of our Pontificate.

(b) In his Preface to his Pars I. sec. 15. & 16.

*I have not room or leisure here to make Reflections upon the odd management of the Pope towards this poor Dominican, who does not refrain complaining (b.) that such a Tempest should be raised against him, and nothing laid to the Prelates of France, to the Doctors of the Sorbonne, who all taught and wrote the same that he had done in any of these Books concerning the Pope's Jurisdiction or Infallibility: Nay, that he should be condemned for writing that, which this Pope himself had approved of in his Approbation of the Bishop of Meaux's Exposition. I think NATALIS ALEXANDRE ought to be added to the Instances of the Sincerity that was used in the APPROBATION of that Book of the Bishop of Meaux, for which, tho' he himself had thanks, yet it seems others must have Lashes and Curses for holding and asserting*

serting the same Doctrines that De Meaux does there. As for our Compiler, what condition soever he may look upon himself to be in, notwithstanding his frequenting the Romish Chappels, I must assure him that He is by the drawing up of this Nubes Testium, become one of us, that is, lyes under the Pope's Curse, and that he hath laid himself open to the malice of his Enemies of his own Party, who now may inform the Pope's Nuncio against him, and prove the Charge severely enough against him from this Answer, which he hath drawn upon himself.

Having done with the Compiler; before I conclude my Introduction, I must not forget to be civil to a late Adversary who was pleased to do me the Honour to lead me in Triumph with the Excellent Dean of C. As he afforded me a place in his Introduction to his TRANSUBSTANTIATION DEFENDED, so I was resolved to provide him a room in mine, and not to trouble my book with one that nibbles only at half a Page in the Veteres Vindicati or Expostulatory Letter to Mr. Sclater of Putney.

He is very angry at my Argument about determining the *THIS* in the Proposition, *THIS IS MY BODY*, to mean Bread, and takes me to task about my Logick, as if I had never looked into one or had forgot it: I suppose my crime is, that I did not talk Metaphysically, and argue in Mood and Figure, and skirmish with my Dilemma's and Sorites'es, with Idea's and Predicates, with Identicals and Tautologicals; which are things very edifying and extremely instructive to a Common Reader. As to my Ignorance therefore in Logick, I cannot help it at present, but will, when I am a little better convinced of my want therein, than our Author hath been able to do it: but for mis-calling the Sorites an Induction, and not putting my Propositions in Mood and Figure, I must tell him, that I had two pretty good reasons, the one was, because I would not, and the other, because I durst not.

I would not, because I believed that Induction was a word better known to the Generality of Readers than Sorites, and that a plain rational way was more convictive to

a Common Reader, than to disturb him with my Majors and Minors, with my Ergo's and Predicates, if I could fairly avoid them. I durst not, for fear of the Poet, for I could not but remember, how very angry the Poet was with a very learned Answerer for arguing too closely, how he twisted him with ergoteering, and call'd him Grim Logician, and I was therefore so affraid lest when he next fell to Hind-and-Panthering, and to sorting out his beasts, I should have been made a Beast for my pains, and have been nicknam'd Ifgrim the Logician, to distinguish me from his other Ifgrim.

Veneris Vindicati, p. 57.

These reasons I hope will be accepted, if not, as soon as I know it, I will think of better: And in the mean time look after the Vindication of my Argument to determine the *THIS* in our Saviours words to mean Bread; I was saying above in that page which this Gentleman carps at, that if I could prove that the *THIS* in those words was Bread, that Proposition must not be taken in a literal (or if he pleases in a proper) sense: And I did endeavour to clear it thus, That which our Saviour took into his hands (when he was about the Institution) was Bread; That which He blessed was the same thing that he had taken into his hands; That which he brake was the same thing that he had blessed; That which He gave them when he said it was his Body, was that which he had broken; But that which He broke, which he blessed, which he took into his hands was BREAD: Therefore it was Bread, which he gave his Disciples; and by *THIS* is meant This Bread. (a)

(a) Veneris Vindicati, p. 57.

This Induction I said was so fair and so clear that I was sure Mr. Slater could not evade it.

This my Answerer calls mighty boasting, and will needs have it that the Induction is a meer fallacy and Illusion, and which is as obliging, tells me, it proceeded from Ignoratio Elenchi, Ignorance of Argument or Proof. But how I pray? Why, after he hath run me down with a Kitchen-boy, and forc't me into an Absurdity, as he I warrant him, good man, thought he had; He very gravely assures me that it could not be Bread, because it was then changed,



changed. Before we make one step further, I must ask him what Church he is of, this I know he will be angry at, but it is necessary, because he either is not of the Church of Rome, or doth not understand his own Church. I am enquiring what is meant by the Word *THIS* at the beginning of the Proposition, *THIS IS MY BODY*, and collected that it was Bread, because that was the Subject of our Saviour's Discourse and Actions immediately before: But this Gentleman answers me that it could not be bread because it was then changed, that is, to reconcile him and his Church together, the Bread was changed, and it was not changed. It was not changed, saith the Church of Rome, since the change ensues the pronouncing the whole Proposition of *THIS IS MY BODY*. It was changed saith the Answerer to me; But whether before or at the pronouncing of *THIS* he hath not told us. I cannot but desire of him, who is so civil as to send me to read Logick again, that he would condescend so far as look into the Council of Florence, and see by whose words and when the Change of the Bread is made in Consecration. Let him look into Turrecremata's Discourse there to convince (b) the Orientals that the Change is onely made by the pronouncing of our Lords own words, *THIS* is my Body, and then tell me whether he is still of the opinion that by *THIS* cannot be meant the Bread, since it is already changed.

As this is enough to shew not only the weakness of his answer, but the Silliness of his argument from Raw Flesh, and Water, and Sacramental Bread, so what follows will as fully discover his dissingenuity: After I had spoken of the clearness of my Induction, I urged my Argument further, that if by *THIS* is not meant the Bread, I desired to know what it was exclusive to Bread; And further, how the Bread could be by the words, *THIS IS MY BODY*, converted into the Body of Christ, if the Bread was not mentioned here, nor meant by the word *THIS*.

This part of the Argument our Answerer durst not undertake, but very fairly slips it over the connected to the Induction,

(b) Concil. 7  
Floren. Pars  
2. Collatio.  
22. Num.  
5, 8. p. 1143,  
1153. in  
Tom. 12.  
Concil. Edit.  
Cossart.  
1572.

Virens Vin-  
dicati, p. 57.

Induction. and falls to upbraiding me, as if I was for being the Great Champion of the Protestant Cause, and derides my next words about my saying this matter and argument was so demonstrative, that I could not but stand amazed that Men who pretend to reason could refuse it; as if what he had said had fully answered the demonstration (as he calls it) when as he had not the face to say one word to the latter, and stronger part of it. This is just as if one in the Schools could say, Nego minorem to the first Syllogism of his opponent, and not one Syllable to the following Syllogisms wherein the Argument is brought to a Head, and yet brag that he had not onely answered, but exposed his Opponent.

And so he deals with me about my Remarks upon this thing. I observed that tho' our Saviour did not say plainly, This Bread is my Body, yet he said according to St. Luke and St. Paul, This CUP is the new Testament in my Blood, which passage I thought and said did fully determine, that the Bread was as much meant in the This is my Body, as the Cup was in the This is my Blood in St. Matthew and St. Mark. This the Answerer will not allow, but goes as weakly to work about disproving as any Adversary could wish. He begins with an excellent Observation that the word This in the Proposition, This Cup is the new Testament in my Blood, is joyned to the word Cup, by a known Figure. I will lay him all I shall be worth this year, that there is never a Schoolmaster in this City can tell me by what Figure it is that *T H I S* is joyned to Cup, and for my part I have forgot my Rhetorick as well as Logick if there be such a Figure: And am affraid it is some Metaphysical not Rhetorical Figure: But to leave this ridiculous stuff, what he would say is, that by this Cup is meant That which is contained in the Cup: And pray who ever denyed this, and how does this disprove me? His only business is to bewilder himself, I brought that plain passage in St. Paul, This Cup, to determine what was meant by the *T H I S* in the Obscure one in St. Matthew; He is  
for

for carrying it back, and for illustrating the plain Text by the obscure one, which is such a sottish sort of management, as will perplex Controversy to eternity, and make every thing alike obscure.

His further Answer is, that if we explain the words This Cup, &c. to mean This Wine is my Blood (as it most certainly ought to be) then the words in this sense will be contrary to the Rules of Humane discourse, as he says he shews p. 33, 34 of his Book.

I have looked there, and desire every one else that hath a mind to read two or three Pages about nothing. I will onely answer that our sense of the words is onely contrary to his Rules of Discourse; and that since He was not the Master of Language to our Saviour, to teach him how to express himself, we will be ruled by our Saviour's words, and the phrase of the Eastern Nations when our Saviour conversed in the world, and not by this pragmatistical Master of Mataphysical Ceremonies.

He hath had enough of this Remark, and therefore lets the other pass quietly, wherein I observed that as our Saviour, after Consecration called the Wine the Fruit of (c) the Vine, so St. Paul does not less than three times call the Bread after Consecration Bread. I have promised in my Book, and therefore should have shewn here against my Adversary, that not onely our Saviour's and the Apostles expressions cannot be understood otherwise than to mean by THIS the Bread, but that St. Ignatius and Justin, Irenæus and Origen, and twenty other Fathers do say of Bread, that It is the Body of Christ, which it cannot be any otherwise than in a figurative sense: but since I am told I shall have occasion to made deeper into this Controversy, I shall reserve it for a further opportunity, if the Superiours have a mind to have the Antiquary of Putney set forth once more in his true Colours. But this, as He and They can agree it, I will onely tell him here, that I hope in God I am able, and that I am sure I am willing to make good the Charge drawn up against him in the Expostulatory Letter.

I have but one word more to my Answerer, that he is very disingenious in saying that I have a Reserved Distinction of Christ's

(c) Matth.  
26. 29.

(d) *Veteres*  
*Vindicati,*  
p. 102.

Christ's Natural and Spiritual Flesh and Blood; whereas if any one will take the pains to consult that place which he refers to in my Book, he will find that the Distinction is not mine, but the Fathers (d) and that by Spiritual was meant Christ's Sacramental or Symbolical Body, as he might have seen often enough in that Book.

*This is all that concerns me in that Introduction to TRANSUBSTANTIATION DEFENDED; I shall not trouble my self with the rest of the Introduction, or with the Book, I will only tell him, that he is fallen in to the hands of one, who it's forty to one will spoil his ever putting out his Second Part against that Incomparable Discourse; but that if he does, and brings any thing against me (as he threatens to do) in that Second Part worth answering, I will take care to return him the civility of an Answer, and only desire him that he would manage what he says there with a little more care, clearness and ingenuity; or else I may be persuaded not to throw away my time in answering such weak and silly objections as He hath made against me here.*

(1)

A N

# A N S W E R

T O

## The COMPILER of the Nubes Testium.

---

### C H A P. I.

*Concerning the Donatists.*

### S E C T. I.

**T**HE Compiler of the *Nubes Testium*, having undertaken to shew, in the *thirty seventh Chapter* of his *Papist Misrepresented and Represented*, the great improbability of any Innovations being made by the Church of Rome in *Matters of Faith*, was almost willing in that place to have made it evident from the *Unanimous Tradition* of the *Primitive Fathers* of the *first five hundred years* especially; for which good purpose He was making up his Collections, as he tells us <sup>a</sup>, but finding the *Matter to increase much beyond expectation upon his hands*, He did reserve them for another Occasion, and hath now acquitted himself of that obligation in the publishing of this Book.

<sup>a</sup> Papist Mis-  
represent. and  
Represent. p. 57.

In his *first Book* he was very solicitous with abundance of words to remove the false slander (as he would have it thought) of Novelty affixed to his Church; in this Book He is as desirous of

B

doing



doing it by an Abundance of *Quotations* out of the *Primitive Fathers*, and thereby of throwing it among us of the *Reformation*.

Since Novelty in Faith therefore is such a Scandal, as all, that are Christians, are for clearing themselves from; we of the Church of England are very willing to join issue with this Compiler, and to refer the Judgment of the Points of Controversie betwixt us and the Church of Rome, set down by him in this Book, to the *Writings* of the *Primitive Fathers*: that so after a fair and true stating of the particular Points in debate, and the calling in of the Testimonies of the *first Fathers*; the learned and unlearned part of the World also may see whether of the *two Churches* of England or Rome deserves the charge of Novelty, and whether of them, after all this dust that hath been raised, must be content to wear this hated badge of Novelty and Innovation. Since the *One* of them must of necessity doe it in this great Division of *Doctrine*, and Difference of *Practice*, that is so visible betwixt them.

I shall proceed in the *Method* used by the *Compiler*, and fairly examine how, and whether the Testimonies from *Antiquity* (all which (excepting two or three) our *Compiler* hath, without making the least mention of it, borrowed from *Natalis Alexandre*) do declare for, and illustrate the present *Doctrines* and *Practices* of the Church of Rome.

Our *Compiler* begins his Book with an Account of the *Donatists* Schism and Heresie; which He hath collected out of *Natalis Alexandre's* Account of them in his *Pars prima Seculi quarti*, from

<sup>a</sup> Natalis Alexandri Selecta Historia Ecclesiastica Capita, &c. Paris, 1679.

page 30<sup>b</sup>. I shall not trouble my self with any Observations upon that Account of the *Donatists* in this place; nor my Reader with any dissent about the beginning of this Schism, betwixt the Learned *H. Valesius* and *Father Alexandre*; but proceed to the first charge against the *Donatists*, and the *Fathers* Opposition to it; who did (as our *Compiler* tells us) maintain against those *Schismatics*; That in the Church of Christ there are both good and wicked men: That her Faith remains Pure and Uncorrupted, notwithstanding the Sins of her corrupt Members, and that their wickedness is not sufficient

<sup>c</sup> Nubes Testimentum, page 2. Motive for any to desert her Communion.

For the Proof of this our *Compiler* cites the Testimonies of *St. Cyprian*, *St. Austin*, *St. Hierom*, and *St. Austin* again, every syllable of which *Quotations* are taken out of *Natalis Alexandre's* thirty eighth

*eighth Dissertation* against the *Donatists*; <sup>d</sup>; the first from page 173. <sup>e</sup> In his *Paras* of that *Dissertation*, the second from page 174. the third from page 175. the last from pages 178, 179.

I wonder how this *Gentleman* came to begin this *Book* with the *Business* of the *Donatists*. The *Title-page* of his *Book* tells us, that his *Collections* concern the chief points of *Controversie* at present under debate; now this is so far from being a chief point, that it is no point of *Controversie* at all betwixt us at present: He that hath been so much concerned in the *Debates* of late, cannot but very well know, that this thing of the *Wickedness* of some *Members* in the *Church of Rome* hath not been insisted on, or ever urged as the *Reason* of the *Division* betwixt us and them. And indeed it would have puzzled me to have guessed, what this business of the *Donatists* was now started for, and what service it would doe these *Gentlemen* of the *Church of Rome*, had I not found in *Father Alexandre* himself<sup>e</sup>, that those *Proofs* of the *Fathers* were as severe upon the *Lutherans* and *Calvinists* (among one of which parties I know they rank us of the *Church of England*) as upon the *Donatists* themselves.

<sup>e</sup> *Dissertatio*  
*tricesima oc-*  
*tava, in Para-*  
*secunda Se-*  
*culi quarti,*  
*pag. 158.*

But this is such a misty *Consequence*, as I confess I cannot see through, or penetrate into it; the *Fathers* taught, that none ought to forsake the *Communion* of the *Church* for the wicked lives of any members thereof, and that the *Donatists* were *Schismaticks* for forsaking it upon such an account; these *Proofs* by consequence (says *Father Alexandre*) hold as strong against our modern *Schismaticks*, but how I pray? do the *Calvinists* and *Lutherans* make the bad lives of some *Papists* the reason of their *Separation* from them? It was great pity that *F. Alexandre* does not shew where they do; because without the doing it, he makes this the pitifullest *Consequence* I ever read, and very unbecoming one that sets up for a *Writer* of *Panoplies* against all *Hereticks*.

Our *Compiler* should not have omitted, how this business of the *Donatists* reaches us, but should have e'en borrowed the *Consequence* to have mawled us with it, as well as he does the *Quotations* from the *Dominican*: but perchance He hath found by dear experience, that such *Consequences* will not down here in *England*, and therefore was so wise as to omit it, and to leave Him, that made it, to defend it.

Since then the bringing in of this *Error* of the *Donatists* was to no purpose in the *World*, but very silly, and very ridiculous,

if designed against *us*; nor consequently the Testimonies of the *Fathers* about it, I should now pass on to his next head; but before I do that, I will here observe to the *Reader*, that our *Compiler* is so exact a Transcriber of his *Master*, *Father Alexandre*, that, where the *Master* is guilty of fault, he is not ashamed of being so too: *F. Alexandre* quotes *St. Austin*, l. 3. cont. *Crescon*. c. 34, 45, 36. I have perused those Chapters, but cannot find those passages there; however our *Compiler* is happier, for he finds them exactly there, or else takes *Father Alexandre's* word for them; I leave it to the *Reader* to judge whether is the more probable.

I cannot but complain here of that *Father* himself also, that in his other <sup>f</sup> Testimony from *St. Austin* he hath dealt unfaithfully with his *Reader*, he doth omit in the middle of the Quotation some considerable Names without giving any notice of it by a Mark of distinction where the sentence is broke off. *St. Austin* in this place is taking to task an Objection of the *Donatists* against the Church, for the Wickedness of some Members thereof, particularly of some Bishops of *Rome*, whom they accused of having been Traditours, and of having offered incense to the Heathen Gods. He answers their Objection by telling them, that it did

<sup>f</sup> *Prorsum qualescunque fuerint*, [here *Nat. Alexandre* and our *Compiler* leave off] *Marcellinus*, *Marcellus*, *Sylvester*, *Melchianus*, *Mensurius*, *Cæcilianus*, atque alii quibus obijciunt pro sua dissensione quod volunt, [now they begin again] *nihil præjudicat Ecclesie Catholica toto terrarum orbe diffusa; nullo modo eorum innocentia coronamur; nullo modo eorum iniquitate damnatur*. *D. Aug. de Unico Bapt. cont. Petilian.* c. 16. p. 342. Edit. *Erasm.* 1528.

not at all prejudice the Catholick Church, & what sort of men soever *Marcellinus*, *Marcellus*, *Sylvester* and *Melchianus* [Bishops of *Rome*] *Mensurius*, *Cæcilianus* [Bishops of *Carthage*] and the rest were, to whom they in defence of their Schism did object what things they pleased, that their innocence would not crown us, (whose then I pray are the merits that are in the Treasury of the Church, and to what purpose are they kept there) nor their wickedness damn us. An Answer that doth at once ruin the *Papal Infallibility* and *Supremacy*, and therefore was the more likely to be concealed by

one of that Church. I do not lay the accusation against our *Compiler* also, because he, good man, was, I believe, purely passive in the thing, and if he is here unfaithfull to *St. Austin* and to the *Reader*, it is because his *Guide* was unfaithfull to him.



## S E C T. II.

The next *Error* of the *Donatists* is about the failure of the *Nubes Testi-*  
*Church*, in *Opposition* to which our *Compiler* tells us, that the *Fa-*um, p. 6.  
*thers* maintain, That the *Catholick Church* cannot fail, as being assisted  
 by the *Spirit of God*.

I am as much at a loss about this point of *Controversie* as I was  
 about the first; I have not met with any of our *Writers* that are  
 for proving or asserting, that this *Catholick Church* can fail, and  
 am thereby pretty well assured, that it is none of the *Tenets* of  
 our *Church-men*, that the *Catholick Church* can or hath failed; and  
 I am as certain that it is none of the *Doctrines* of the *Church*  
 it self; so that I must beg this *Gentleman's* pardon, that I can-  
 not believe, that this opinion of the failure of the *Catholick*  
*Church* is one of the chief points of *Controversie* at present under de-  
 bate: I am so far from being of that faith, that I think it not  
 onely ridiculous, but false, to assert that there is any *Controversie*  
 betwixt us about the failing or not failing of the *Catholick Church*;  
 and I cannot but observe that our *Compiler*, who is so carefull in the  
*Appendix* to his *Collections* to gather the *Concessions* or *Assertions*  
 of *Protestants* about the points and heads of *Controversie* in  
 his *Book*, either forgot to produce their *Assertions* and *Concessions*  
 concerning this and the precedent point, or was not able to pro-  
 duce any, which I am the more ready to believe, because I look  
 on the thing as impossible.

If then, notwithstanding this *Gentleman*, there really be no  
*Controversie* betwixt us touching this head, both parties believing  
 that the *Catholick Church* by reason of our blessed *Lord* his promised  
 assistance cannot fail; it will very readily be granted; that all the  
 citations out of the *Fathers*, upon this head against the *Donatists*,  
 do not in the least affect or concern the *Church of England*, since  
 she detests that *Error* of the *Donatists* as much as any other  
*Church* can.

I need not therefore examine the particular passages, since,  
 granting them all the strength and evidence they are produced for,  
 they are not at all against the *Church of England*. I will onely  
 inform the Reader, that the passages for this point are taken out  
 of the same Volume, and the same *Dissertation* of *Natalis Alexandre*

<sup>b</sup> that the former were borrowed from. I must except the first <sup>b See *Differ-*</sup>  
 quotation <sup>ratio 38. ars</sup>  
 164. <sup>secunda Secu-</sup>  
<sup>li quarti,</sup>  
 p. 182, 185,

<sup>1</sup> Nub. Test.  
p. 6.

quotation from St. Cyprian, which does not occur in that place, but is, I question not, borrowed from some other part of *N. Alexandre's* works: I must observe also that our *Compiler* does in the *first Testimony* <sup>1</sup> from St. Cyprian exactly transcribe the Errors of his *Guide*, and that the *Guide himself* either did not look into St. *Austin* for this passage, but very honestly copied some *Romish Friend* of his, or was more than half asleep, when he was writing this passage thence: without one of these I cannot see how he should put *reges* for *regna*, and *virtutis* for *fortitudinis* in the beginning of it. I have looked into two or three Editions for this thing, and find them exactly agreeing in this place, and directly against the *Guide* and the *Compiler*.

### S E C T. III.

Nub. Test.  
p. 10.

The last crime of the *Donatists* set down by our *Compiler* is their *Schism*, upon which he says, the *Fathers* unanimously declare, that *whosoever breaks the Unity of the Catholick Church, upon any pretext whatsoever, is guilty of Schism, &c.*

I am so far from the humour of making disputes or quarrels in things wherein there ought to be none, and so desirous of reaching that part of his *Book* which does contain matter of real Disputes betwixt us, that I shall here assure our *Author*, that taking the word *Pretext* here in the sense wherein it is commonly used among us, for a false shew or groundless pretence, I am perfectly of his *Father's* mind, that it is destructive of *Salvation* causelessly to break the *Unity of the Catholick Church*; and that the *Donatists*, who acted thus, were really guilty of a *Criminal Schism*; but I must withall assure our *Compiler*, that I cannot see how this can be made matter of dispute betwixt us, who both agree in asserting the same thing with those venerable *Fathers*, or how this can any way affect or concern the Division that is at present betwixt us and the particular Church of *Rome*; that Church tells us, that they separate from us upon grounds which make such a Separation absolutely necessary, and we prove against them, that our *Reasons* for not communicating with them are much more absolutely such, and that *Communion with them* upon the *Terms* fixt by their *Council of Trent* were destructive of *Salvation*, and therefore by no means to be espoused.

Our

Our Compiler hath gathered a great many Authorities of the Fathers upon this head, to every one of which we of the Church of England do very heartily subscribe, and are at the same time able from Scripture and Antiquity to justify our necessary separation from the Bishop and Church of Rome. I heartily wish those that allowed this Book to the Press and all the Romish Missionaries in England would consider the quotations on this point of Schism, from St. Cyprian especially, and above the rest, that about the aliud Altare, which was always so odious in the Catholick Church, and will be so, while there is a Church of Christ on Earth.

All the passages upon this head, except two or three, are to be found with the very same mistakes in them, in the same Volume and Dissertation of Natalis Alexandre<sup>k</sup>, the first with a foolish consequence about Calvinists sympathizing with the Donatists tack'd to the end of it, in p. 187. the next with the rest in page 187, 188, 189, 223, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 230, 196. The passage from St. Austin in p. 230. in Nat. Alexandre<sup>l</sup> is very much abused, non eo ad demonia; sed tamen in parte Donati sum, is not all that Saint Austin says here, it is much fuller in him; and Father Alexandre had shewed himself an ingenuous man, if instead of putting in Luther and Calvin's name there, after Donatus, which is nothing to the purpose, he had put in what should have been there, and let us see the Text of St. Austin, which runs thus, nec eo ad adoranda demonia, non servo lapidibus, sed tamen in parte Donati sum. I wonder why F. Alexandre should be so much afraid of this passage; though we do object to his Church, as a most grievous crime, the giving religious worship to Saints and Angels, and their Images, yet he cannot but know that we do not lay to their charge the worshipping of Devils, which we are very glad our selves that we cannot doe.

But I begin to suspect strongly that Father Alexandre and our Compiler are very near a-kin, that our Compiler hath made the same use of N. Alexandre, that Alexandre himself hath done of others: that which inclines me very much to this Opinion is, that Father Alexandre never tells us, that I have observed, what Editions of the Fathers he used, nor quotes the page where one may find his quoted passage above once in five hundred passages (I believe) through all his Volumes.

<sup>k</sup> Dissertatio  
tricesima oc-  
tava, Pars  
secunda Seculi  
quarti.

<sup>l</sup> Nubes Test.  
p. 20.  
Nat. Alex.  
p. 230.

## C H A P. II.

*Concerning the Pope's Supremacy.*

## S E C T. I.

**A**FTER twenty pages spent about matters that do not at all concern our present Controversie, we are come to that which must be allowed not onely to be a Controversie, but the greatest of any that are now on foot in the World, and which hath been and is the cause of all those tyrannical pretensions and uncanonical impositions which do at present divide the Christian World. The Pope's Supremacy is that point which the Members of the Church of Rome, especially the Ultramontaines, are so carefull to defend, and we of the Reformation to oppose.

Our Compiler being now come to a point of debate doth not forget his art of palliating, which was so very serviceable to him in his Misrepresentations and Representations of Popery. He cannot but know (and therefore ought to have avoided it) that this loose talk about Successor of Peter, and Centre of Catholick Communion does not reach the Pretensions of the Bishops of Rome, nor fully and fairly declare what Power, Jurisdiction and Authority, in and over the Catholick Church those Bishops challenge as their right.

*Nub. Testium,*  
p. 22.

To let him see how loosely he manages this debate betwixt us, I can with putting in two or three necessary words subscribe to all our Compiler says for the Pope, and yet be as far from owning the Pope's Supremacy, as the Church of England is or ever was. The Fathers teach, says our Compiler, that Christ built his Church upon Peter: so say I too, if by Fathers here be meant two or three of them, and not the Fathers unanimously (as he hath it before) or generally. That the Bishop of Rome is the Successour of Saint Peter, is what I can also grant, and that That See is the Centre of the Catholick Communion, if I may but put in here what is absolutely necessary, while possessed by an Orthodox Bishop, and that whosoever separates himself from it (I add, professing the true Faith, and possessed by a Catholick Bishop,) is guilty of Schism. I can, I say, subscribe (though I do not) to all this, without any Obligation in the least of believing the Pope's Supremacy: all that our

Compiler

*Compiler* puts down here, reaching no farther than a *Primacy of Order*, does not at all suppose in the *Popes* any *Jurisdiction* or *Authority* over the *Catholick Church*.

Since then our *Compiler* seems to be afraid of setting down a true account of this Controversie betwixt us by mincing the matter so much about the *Pope's* power, I must borrow of him his last Quotation under this head, the Canon of the Council of Florence, and set that down as the true account of their Doctrine concerning the *Pope's* power, and then not onely shew our reasons, why we dare not submit to it, but that all the Testimonies our *Compiler* hath put down (from *F. Alexandre*, except two or three) under this head do not prove the *Pope's* Supremacy, as it is stated by their General Council of Florence. <sup>m</sup> We define (says the Canon) that the Holy Apostolick See and Bishop of Rome is invested with the Primacy over the whole World, and that the Bishop of Rome is the Successour of Saint Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and that he is the true Vicar of Christ, and Head of the whole Church, and the Father and Doctour of all Christians, and that the full power of feeding, ruling, and governing the whole Church was given to him in St. Peter, by our Lord Jesus Christ, as it is expressed or contained in the Acts of General Councils, and in the Holy Canons.

<sup>m</sup> Diffinitimus  
Sanctam Apo-  
stolicam Se-  
dem & Ro-  
manum Pon-  
tificem, in u-  
niversum or-  
bem tenere  
Primum, &  
ipsum Pon-  
tificem Roma-  
num Successo-

rem esse Beati Petri Principis Apostolorum, & verum Christi Vicarium, totiusque Ecclesie Caput, & omnium Christianorum Patrem ac Doctorem existere; & ipsi in Beato Petro pascendi, regendi ac gubernandi universalem Ecclesiam, à Domino nostro Jesu Christo, plenam potestatem traditam esse, quemadmodum etiam in Gestis Oecumenicorum Conciliorum, & in Sacris Canonibus continetur. Concil. Florent. Pars 2. Collatio 22. p. 1135. Edit. Cossart.

The Reader will very easily see what a great difference there is betwixt this account of the *Pope's* Supremacy and that set down by our *Compiler*; and yet this Gentleman would be thought to be an exact Stater of the Controversie betwixt us, and to have represented fairly what the Doctrine of the Church of Rome is concerning their *Popes* Power and *Jurisdiction*. I hope I am out of the danger of being made a *Misrepresenter*, while I charge that onely upon them as their Doctrine, which hath been defined by one of their General Councils, which is the greatest strength and countenance that any Doctrine is capable of among them.

This then being the true state of their Doctrine concerning their *Popes* Power or Supremacy, and that which I would call naked Popery, I am sure I have Commission from the Church of England to  
C declare,



declare, that *she* cannot, without betraying the *Rights* of all *Bishops*, and the *Interest* of the *Catholick Church*, espouse the *Doctrine* of the *Pope's Supremacy*; which *we* of her *Communion* do believe is altogether without foundation either from *Scripture* or *Primitive Antiquity*.

It will not be consistent with that brevity I have confined my self to in this *Answer*, to go through our several arguments against this usurped *Supremacy* of the *Bishops* of *Rome*. I am onely desirous to consider, in short, whence they have this their extraordinary Power, which they do as extraordinarily contend for: there are but *Three Sources* whence they can pretend to derive it; either that it is from the *Law* of *God* set down in the *Scriptures*, or from the *Laws* of the *Universal Church* to be seen in her *Code*; or, lastly, from the *favour* and *authority* of *secular Princes*; the first of these is that which they commonly claim and insist upon; the second is what this *Canon* of the *Florentine Council* doth challenge also in the *Conclusion* of it; though our *Compiler* is so sly in the translating of it, as if the *Canon* meant onely that the *Bishop* of *Rome* should govern the *Universal Church* according to the *Acts* of *General Councils*, and to the *Holy Canons*; whereas it is plain, this *Canon* speaks not of the *Exercise*, but of the *Original* of the *Pope's Power*, and of the *Testimonies* for it in the *Acts* and *Canons* of the *General Councils*; but *F. Alexandre* himself taught our *Compiler* to translate thus<sup>n</sup>; and truly, I think, he ought to have the *Reputation* of first finding the *Gallican Liberties* in this *Definition* of the *Council* of *Florence*, which *Council* was not usually thought to have been such a friend to the *Gallican Liberties*, witness what the *Cardinal* of *Lorrain* is said to have spoken of it in just such another *Council* at *Trent*: but the *Men* of this age are strangely set upon making new discoveries; this age found out that the *Libri Carolini*, nor the *Council* of *Frankfort* were not against the *Image-council* of *Nice*; that *Bertram* was as true a man for *Transubstantiation* as *Paschasius Radbertus* that first (in all probability) forged it; and our *Nat. Alexandre* must come in for his share for discovering that greatest thing the *French Clergy* are so earnest upon in this *Definition* of the *Council* of *Florence*.

\* *Dissertatio*  
*quarta*, *Par.*  
*prima*, *Sec.*  
*prim.* p. 398.

## S E C T. II

The places of Scripture that are urged by the Church of Rome to prove the Divine Institution of the Pope's Supremacy are very few, that of St. Matthew with another from St. John: *Nat. Alexandre* our Compiler's Guide doth insist upon them for the proof of the Pope's Supremacy. One would expect that they should be very clear and very full Texts, that are brought to confirm such a Perpetuous Authority as the Papal Supremacy appears to be.

St. Matthew doth relate \* that upon St. Peter's having confessed our Saviour to be the Son of the living God; our Saviour should say unto him, *Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church, and the Gates of hell shall not prevail against it; and I will give unto thee the Keyes of the Kingdom of Heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, &c.* Here they tell us that our Saviour built his Church upon St. Peter, who is the Rock mentioned here, and that he was thereupon invested with all Church power, the power of the Keyes, which power and government was by him deposited with his Successours the Bishops of Rome. \* Matth. 16.  
18, 19.

In answer to this we say that there is nothing extraordinary or particular for St. Peter here, because He is not the Rock mentioned here, nor had the power of the Keyes committed to him any otherwise than in common with the rest of his fellow-Apostles: as our Saviour put the Question to all the Apostles, so St. Peter answering it in the name of them all, had the promise of, or received this power of the Keyes in behalf of them all, and for their common use of them. Since then this place of Scripture is not sufficiently evident, or clear for the purpose, both parties claiming an interest in it for their contrary senses; and we avouching that it is absolutely against St. Peter's being either Rock, or having any particular extraordinary power, if it be considered with its relation to the context before, and to the rest of the Gospels and Epistles; either this passage of St. Matthew as obscure must be set aside as useless towards the proof of a Supremacy; or They of the Church of Rome must convince us, that the Unanimous Consent of Fathers did always interpret this place of Scripture in favour of St. Peter's Supremacy. This thing one would think they were very able to doe, since they are so ready to say they can, and to assert that the Fathers did unanimously interpret the Rock mentioned in this passage to be the Person

¶ *Nubes Test.* of St. Peter. Thus our Compiler <sup>p</sup> very gravely tells us, that the Fathers teach that Christ built his Church upon Peter, and this F. Alexandre had taught him to say, who certainly had considered the thing very well, when he <sup>q</sup> tells us, that the Fathers did with a Nemine contradicente <sup>r</sup> interpret the Rock to be meant of St. Peter.

¶ *Dissert. 4.*  
 P. 1. Sec. 1.  
 p. 274.

¶ *Quocirca*

*Sancti Patres*  
*Communi sus-*  
*fragio, &c.*

*Ibid. p. 274.*

Ignorance among all people is allowed to alleviate a crime, and a blind-fold implicit transcribing of a Writer's sense must be allowed to be very near allyed unto it, or else our Compiler ought to be treated as a person guilty of very disingenuous and unjust behaviour towards the memory of the Fathers: F. Alexandre however, who taught our Compiler to publish so gross an untruth, is by no means excusable; for should we allow him to be ignorant in the Fa-

¶ *Accedat* [speaking of Peter's being the Rock] *consensu Ecclesie totius, & Græcorum ac Latinorum Patrum, &c.* Bellarm. de Romano Pontifice, l. 1. c. 10.

thers own writings, and to have transcribed this bold untruth out of Bellarmine <sup>r</sup> or some other of their Writers, yet He cannot be ignorant, I am sure, how fully his learned Countrey-man, the famous Monsieur Lannoy, hath examined the sense of the Fathers and Ecclesiastical Writers

¶ *Lannoi* E-  
 pist. ad Guil.  
 Voellum a-  
 pud Part. 5.  
 Epistolæ,  
 p. 4, 11, 18,  
 38.

upon this Text of St. Matthew; how distinctly he hath put down the four different Interpretations of the Rock in this Text, the first of which makes it to be the Person of St. Peter, the second makes it to be all the Apostles with their Successors, the third teaches that it is the Faith confessed by St. Peter, and the last, that the Rock here is the Person of Christ himself <sup>t</sup>. Natalis Alexandre cannot but know how invincibly this most learned Sorbonist hath shewn, that the Generality of Fathers and Ecclesiastical Writers are for the third Interpretation, which makes the Faith confessed by St. Peter, and not St. Peter himself, to be the Rock on which Christ's Church was built: that a great many are for the fourth Interpretation, that says, the Rock was Christ himself. This last Interpretation falling in with the third (for Christ or the Faith confessed concerning Christ come to the same thing) may be with most reason called the unanimous Consent of the Church-Interpreters that the rock here is not Peter; whereas there are but a few of those Fathers for the first Interpretation, and most of their expressions capable of the second, and not inconsistent with the third Interpretation.

So that if the Interpretations of above fifty Fathers and Ecclesiastical Writers, among whom we muster no fewer than eleven Popes and two Synods, are to be admitted against that of three or four Fathers; we are sufficiently secured, that the Interpretation of the  
 Rock



*Rock in this Text, its being the Faith confessed by St. Peter concerning Christ (which is espoused by the Church of England) is true and Catholick: that to interpret it of St. Peter's person is to contradict the Stream of Catholick Antiquity, and consequently that there is no ground from this Text of St. Matthew for the Supremacy of St. Peter or the Bishops of Rome.*

I suppose it will not be expected here that I should set down all these numerous Authorities which the excellent Launoy hath with so much industry collected to prove that by the Rock in this Text is meant the Faith confessed by St. Peter, I will onely put down one or two passages of the Fathers omitted by him, that the World may see that that excellent Person hath not exhausted the Subject, nor produced all the Proofs of those Authours whom He sets down. The first shall be Epiphanius (omitted by Launoy) who brings in our Saviour saying to St. Peter, That upon this Rock of unshaken

\* Faith I will build my Church. St. Chrysostom tells us that our Saviour said, upon this Rock, not upon Peter, for he built his Church not upon the man Peter, but upon the Faith \* which He had confessed. " Καὶ ἔκτισεν, ὅτι ἐπὶ τῇ πέτρᾳ ταύτῃ ἡ ἀσφαλῆς Πίστις οἰκοδομήσω με τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν. Epiph. adv. Hæret. L. 2. T. 1. p. 500. Edit. Par. Petav. 1622. \* Ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ ἣν ἔτιμον, ἐπὶ τῇ Πίστει ἣν ἔτιμον ὡς δὲ ἐπὶ τῇ ἀσφαλῇ, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῇ Πίστει ἑαυτῶν Ἐκκλησίαν οἰκοδομήσωσι. D. Chryl. Sermo de Pentecoste, p. 233. in T. 6. Edit. Duceii, 1636.

As to the latter part of this passage from St. Matthew, to wit, about the promise made to St. Peter of having the *Keyes* bestowed upon him, I am sure it is very far from doing the Romanists any service, since it is abundantly plain, that when our Saviour after his Resurrection came to perform the promise he had made here, He did bestow the Power of the *Keyes* equally among the Apostles, without preferring one Apostle above another, or giving to one a greater share in the Use of the *Keyes* than to the rest; so that if St. John's Gospel be but as Authentick as St. Matthew's, we are fully secured that this Power of the *Keyes* was equally given in Saint John \*, and therefore equally promised in St. Matthew to all the Apostles. It were very easie to shew from abundance of the Fathers Expressions, that there is nothing in this promise peculiar to St. Peter. Origen tells us, that what was promised here was common to the rest of the Apostles †; and Saint Austin informs us somewhere, as I have met with it quoted, that as St. Peter made the Confession in the name, and as the mouth of

\* S. John 20. 21, 22, 23.

† Quod si dictum hoc, tibi dabo claves regni caelorum, cæterisque quoque commune est, &c. Orig. Tr. 1. in Matt. p. 39. Edit. Frøb. 1535.

all the *Apostles*, so He received this promise in the behalf of all, as representing them all.

But if any contend, that this promise was performed as soon as spoken, and therefore that there was something extraordinary and particular to St. Peter here since he is here invested with those *Keyes* which the rest of the *Apostles* had nothing to do with, nor were admitted to any share in them till just before our Saviour his *Ascension*: our Answer is very ready, that the rest of the *Apostles* did certainly here receive the same power of the *Keyes*, that they will have St. Peter invested with; because in the next Chapter but one <sup>a</sup> to this our Saviour speaks to all the *Apostles* as already invested with this power of the *Keyes*: which Assertion of ours the Generality of the *Fathers* are so far from opposing, that the above-named <sup>b</sup> Learned Sorbonist Monsieur Launoy hath with prodigious pains demonstrated that St. Peter did receive the power of the *Keyes* in the name of the *Apostles*, their Successors, and the whole Church, and that the Catholick Church is the proximate Subject of all Church-power; This he hath evidenced from the concurrent Authority of at least <sup>c</sup> seventy *Fathers* and Ecclesiastical Writers, among whom we find eight Councils, three Universities, one Learned King, our Henry the Eighth, eleven Popes and two Rituals, from above two hundred Testimonies (as I think I may safely say it) out of these Writings. So that if these passages from St. Matthew, about the Rock and the Power of the *Keyes* be not invincibly demonstrated to be directly contrary to the Romish Pretensions, and their urging St. Matthew's Expressions for their Popes Supremacy be not hence proved to be extravagantly unreasonable and perfectly groundless, I must e'en say that it is utterly impossible for the wisest man in the World to prove any thing even from the best Evidences, and that the Decree of their Council of Trent, That Scripture be interpreted by the unanimous consent of *Fathers*, is the foolishhest order in the World, if so many and so great Testimonies be not able to rescue these two passages of St. Matthew from the abusive Interpretations of the Popes Up-holders.

The other place of Scripture alledged by them to prove the Divine Institution of St. Peter's Supremacy is that of St. John <sup>d</sup>, wherein our Saviour bids St. Peter thrice to feed his Sheep and Lambs. From this place they say (F. Alexandre among the rest) that the chief care of the Church, and a sacred Principality in it over all conditions as well *Apostles* as others was conferred upon St. Peter by our Saviour: but this

<sup>a</sup> Matth. 18.  
17, 18.

<sup>b</sup> In Ep. ad  
Vallantium.

<sup>c</sup> Launoy Ep.  
ad Hadrian.  
Vallantium  
in Par. secun-  
da Epp.

<sup>d</sup> S. Joh. 21.  
15, 16, 17.

is much easier said than proved, since the natural sense and a fair interpretation of the words extends no farther than a repeated command of feeding Christ's Flock, which hath nothing of extraordinary in it, since the rest of the Apostles had had the same Injunctions, though not in the same terms, laid upon them; and farther if this place must be forced to settle something upon St. Peter, it will make him not the chief, but the sole Pastour of the Catholick Church, since here, just before his Ascension, our Saviour gives his Commands, and commits the Charge of his whole Flock to St. Peter alone: and this is the sense wherein the Council of Florence seems to have taken these words in St. John, when in the Canon I set down above it defines, that the full or whole power of feeding, ruling and governing the whole Church was given to the Pope in St. Peter.

P. 9.

If this be their sense therefore, I desire to know of these men what is become of the charge given to the rest of the Apostles of going to teach (which is the same with feeding) all Nations, which includes old and young, Sheep and Lambs; I would be informed also what there is more either of Authority or Charge in this passage, than in that general Commission in St. Matthew \*: and farther, I would fain know, whether this Commission here about feeding the Sheep and Lambs doth cancell that solemn and general one to all the Apostles in the Chapter next before that, from whence we have this passage about Sheep and Lambs †.

\* Matth. 28.  
19, 20.† Joh. 20.  
21, 22, 23.

Perhaps some may be so impudent to avouch that it doth cancell the other, and some mens Opinions, I am sure, do oblige them to believe it: however we must tell such that St. Paul was not of their Opinion, for when he had sent for the Elders of the Church of Ephesus to Miletus ‡, He honours them with the Title of Bishops; whereas, according to these men they were no Bishops, but St. Peter's Curates; He tells them that the Holy Ghost had made them Pastours of their Flocks, which must be a mistake in St. Paul, since these Elders could not be the Holy Ghost's Pastours, while they were onely St. Peter's Curates, and no Pastours at all.

‡ Acts 20.  
17, 28.

And St. Peter himself is as far from these mens fancies; he would not otherwise have been so forgetfull of himself as to call the Bishops among the dispersed Jews his fellow-Pastours; whereas, according to these men, Those Elders were so far from being Christ's Bishops, that they were but his own Curates, they were so far from being his Equals (as he says they were <sup>b</sup>) that they at most were but his Servants sent by him to feed their several flocks: but enough of this.

<sup>b</sup> 1 Pet. 5. 1, 2.

Both

Both parties of the Romanists, as well those that from this place make St. Peter prime Bishop, as those that make him sole Bishop of the Catholick Church, appeal to the Fathers in defence of their several Interpretations, and thither we are very willing to go with them, and to be judged by the Fathers what is the true sense and import of these words.

St. Cyprian, in his Treat concerning the Unity of the Church (according to Pamelius's Edition) speaking concerning the Apostles, says, that every of them were Pastours, yet the flock but one, which was to be fed by all the Apostles with their unanimous and united endeavours<sup>i</sup>; and the same thing this excellent Father says in his Epistle to Stephen, Bishop of Rome, (whom He calls his Brother) that though they were many Pastours [they two among the rest] yet that the flock was but one, which they were to feed, and therefore that it was<sup>k</sup> to be their care to secure and preserve all those Sheep which Christ had purchased by his bloody Passion. In this Epistle one may see the true state of the Catholick Church, and of Episcopal Dignity at that time, how little they thought then of the Bishop of Rome's being either the Prince of Bishops, or the sole Bishop

<sup>i</sup> Et Pastores sunt omnes, sed grex unus ostenditur, qui ab Apostolis omnibus unanimi consensione pascatur. D. Cypri. de Unit. Eccl. Edit. Pamel.

<sup>k</sup> Nam etsi Pastores multi sumus, unum tamen gregem pascimus, & oves universas, quas Christus sanguine suo ac passione quasivit, colligere & fovere debemus. Cypri. Ep. 68. Stephano, p. 178. Edit. Oxon.

<sup>l</sup> —Cui rei in the Church, when St. Cyprian<sup>l</sup> tells Stephen, Bishop of Rome, nostrum est consilium, & that it was every Bishop's Province to take care, lest any damage should subvenire, & accrew to the flock of Christ through Hereticks and such evil Workers, since they [the Bishops] were in common intrusted [not He qui divinam at Rome alone or above the rest] with the Government of the Catholick clementiam & Church.

gubernanda Ecclesie libram tenentes, sic censuram vigeris peccatoribus exhibemus, &c. Idem, Ibidem, p. 176, 177.

St. Ambrose, speaking of our Saviour's bidding Peter to feed his<sup>m</sup> Quas oves Sheep, <sup>m</sup> says, that St. Peter did not receive alone those Sheep and & quem gre- that flock, but that he did receive them in common with the rest of the gem non so- Pastours of the Church, and the Pastours also with him. lum tunc be. Pastours of the Church, & cum illo eas nos suscepimus omnes. D. Ambrosius, de Dignitate Sacerdotali, c. 2. p. 386. T. 4. Edit. Erasmi.

<sup>n</sup> Καὶ ἡ τῶτα St. Chrysostom, in his Dialogue, persuading St. Basil to undertake τῷ πάσκει, --- the Pastoral Charge, assures him that <sup>n</sup> thereby he should shew his love

love towards Christ, if he would feed his flock, since it was recorded in *Scripture*, if thou lovest me, feed my flock.

ἃς περιποιήσας, ἅπαρ δειγμάτια τῶν οἰς τὸ Χρῆσθαι ἀνάγκη, αὐτὴς ἔχουσιν ἡ δὲ Χρῆσθαι οὐκ ἔστι  
 κοινωμάτων ἢ τῶν Ἀποστόλων διαλεξιμῶν — ἐπαίεται, οἱ φίλοις μου, ποιμαίνετε τὰ πρόβατά μου.  
 D. Chryf. de Sacerdotio, c. 1. p. 15. in T. 4. Edit. Ducxi.

St. Austin baffles the Opinions of both parties of the Romanists in a very few, but very expressive words<sup>o</sup>, When it is said to Peter, it is said to all Pastours, lovest thou me? Feed my Sheep.

o Et cum ei  
 [viz. Petro]  
 dicitur, ad

O M N E S dicitur, Amas me? Pasce oves meas. D. August. de Agone Christiano, c. 30. p. 550. in T. 3. Edit. Erasim. 1528.

There is nothing more evident in Antiquity, than that the Bishops of the Catholick Church, looking upon themselves as the Apostles Successours, and intrusted by them with that care and charge of the flock of Christ, which they themselves had from Christ himself, thought themselves obliged by their station in the Church to feed, to preserve, and to watch over the flock of Christ, remembering, that as Christ committed to them that great charge, so He would require as strict an account of their discharge thereof.

And the Bishops of Rome were so far in those days from taking too much upon them, or pretending to a peculiar or sole charge of the Catholick Church, that it is evident from those first times, that the term of Brother, Colleague, and Fellow-Bishop passed mutually from them to others, and from others to them, witness the Synodical Epistle of the Synod of Antioch against Paulus Samosatenus<sup>p</sup>, the Epistle of St. Cyril and the Synod at Alexandria to Nestorius<sup>q</sup>; and several of the Epistles in St. Cyprian; and the learned Monsieur Launoy hath produced the concurrent Authority of about fourty Popes, who in their occasional Letters to other Bishops used the term of Brother or Fellow-Bishop, and thereby owned them their Fellow-Pastours in the charge and government of the flock of Christ<sup>r</sup>.

p Apud Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 7. c. 27.  
 q Concil. T. 3. p. 395. Edit. Cossartii.

If notwithstanding all this, any inquire to what purpose then was this threefold question and charge to St. Peter, though it is answer sufficient to tell them, that they have nothing to do to be so inquisitive, yet since they are, I do refer them to St. Cyril of Alexandria on this place<sup>s</sup>, where they will find that this threefold question about his love to Christ was, to put him on making satisfaction for his threefold denial of Christ; and that the charge of feeding the Sheep was as it were a restoring him to his Apostolical Function from

r J. Launoy Epist. ad Formentinum apud Par. 5. Epp. p. 27, &c.

s — Οὐκ ἔστιν ἡ τοῦ π-  
 τέρους ἐ-  
 νου τοῦ π-  
 τοῦ π-  
 τοῦ π-



αὐτὸς τὸν δ. which he might seem to have fallen by his grievous denial of his Ma-  
 μολογίαν, ἀ-  
 τίσαθ' αὐτὸν ὡ-

σπερ ἐκείνη τῶν πειρῶν, ἢ ἀντίφασιν τοῖς μαρτυροῦν ἐξαρτῶν ἢ ἐκπερὶ δυνάμει. — διὰ τὴν  
 τὴν εὐαγγελίαν, βλάσφημιαν ἀναγινώσκουσαν; ὡς καὶ ἡ δὲ δόξα τοῦ Θεοῦ αὐτῶν  
 καὶ ἐξ ὧν νοεῖται, ἢ μεταξὺ τῶν αὐτῶν ἀποστόλων ἀντιφασίαν. B. Cyril. Comment. in Joann.  
 l. 12. p. 1119, 1120. Edit. Par. 1638.

I have thus proceeded through all the places that are alledged for to ground the *Papal Supremacy* upon *Scripture*; I think I have abundantly shewn, that none of these three places does in the least favour such pretensions, since not onely the comparing these with other places of *Scripture*, but the almost *Unanimous Consent* of *Primitive Fathers* and *Ecclesiastical Writers* (who interpret them in favour of all the *Apostles* against *St. Peter*) does prove, to the perfect silencing of these pretensions, that such a *Supremacy* hath no foundation in *Scripture*; and if it hath none there, it is in a sad condition, since if *Christ* himself did not make the *Bishop* of *Rome* his *Vicar*, all the *General Councils* in the *World* together cannot make him such: I am sure *St. Luke*, who tells *Theophilus* \* that he drew up his former *Treatise* about all that our *Saviour* did till his *Ascension*, does nowhere tell us that he did this, but does in the next verse tell us in effect that he did the direct contrary, while he speaks of his charges to the *Apostles* whom he had chosen.

I cannot omit the observing here, that as none of these places of *Scripture* do prove any *Supremacy* for *St. Peter*, so neither do they prove any *Primacy* or *Prerogative* for him: as they equally concerned all the *Apostles*, so they equally distribute any honour among them, without preferring one above another: This *Observation* I do make for the sake of those *Gentlemen* in *France* especially, who though they have with unanswerable arguments baffled the extravagant pretensions of the *Romish Courtiers*, yet do allow the *Bishop* of *Rome* to be *Christ's Vicar*, instated by him in the *Primacy* over the whole *Church*; I would onely recommend to such the *Consideration* of the *Fathers Interpretations* of the places of *Scripture* cited above, and these three short passages in *Antiquity*; the first from *St. Cyprian*, who, speaking about the nature and government of the *Catholic Church*, says, that there is but one *Episcopacy* in it, whereof every particular *Bishop* of the *Catholic Church* had an equal share and the full power of that *Function* <sup>u</sup>.

<sup>u</sup> *Episcopatum unus est, cuius à singulis in solidum pars tenetur.* Cyprianus, de Unit. Eccl. p. 108. Edit. Oxon.

The second is St. Chrysostom's, who, speaking of the Apostles, tells us, that they were all ordained Princes, [ or Primates if any would have it so ] by our Saviour \*, not [ temporal ] Princes, to receive each his Nation or City, but [ spiritual Princes ] intrusted \* Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος τῆς καθ' ἑαυτὴν ἐκκλησίας **IN COMMON ALL TOGETHER** with the Care and Government of [ the Catholick Church throughout ] the World. \* Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος τῆς καθ' ὅλης ἐκκλησίας

Ἐξουκὶ πάλαι διαφόροι λαμβάνοντες, ἀλλὰ Πάρις Κοιτῇ ὁ Οἰκουμενικὸς ἑμμενδύσας. S. Chrysost. Tom. 8. p. 115. Edit. Savil.

The last shall be that of a Pope himself ( which is more with some people than the Authority of a Thousand Fathers, and let it be so here ) who in an Epistle to a Bishop of Arles compares Episcopacy to the Trinity \*, and says that as in the Trinity there is but one inseparable power, so Episcopacy is but ONE [ though ] in the hands of particular Bishops : I hope those that own the Athanasian Creed, where we are taught that in the Trinity no person is greater or less than another, but that the three Persons are co-equal, will for the future believe with Pope Symmachus, that in the Episcopal Office no Bishop is greater or less than another, but that all the Bishops in the world are co-equal ; and then I am sure all Christians will believe with us, that there was no Superiority, nor Supremacy, nor Primacy, communicated by our blessed Saviour unto any one of his Twelve Apostles.

\* Nam dum ad Trinitatis instar, cujus Una est, atque Indivisa Potestas, Unum sit per diversos Antistites Sacerdotium ; Symach. Ep. 1. ad Aonium Arel. apud T. 4. Concil. p. 1291. Edit. Collart.

### S E C T. III.

Having fully ruined their pretensions from the Holy Scriptures for the Supremacy ; I come next to inquire, whether the Laws of the Universal Church have declared the successive Bishops of Rome to be Christ's Vicars, to have the Primacy over the whole World, to be Heads of the Universal Church, and to have the plenary power of governing and feeding the whole Church. What Laws the primitive Church for the first six Centuries made for the Government and Discipline of the Catholick Church are to be found in the Code of the Canons of the Universal Church, consisting of the Canons of the four Oecumenical Councils of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus and Chalcedon, and of the five diocesan Synods of Ancyra, of Gangra, of Antioch, of Neocaesarea and of Laodicea, confirmed and admitted by

the Council of Chalcedon to be part of the Laws of the Universal Church, and afterwards by the Emperour Justinian in Novel. Const. 231. de Can. Eccl.

We desire therefore to be informed how many of these Canons (which were looked upon as of Sacred Authority, not onely by the Emperour Justinian, in the Novel just cited, but by a Pope, Gre-

<sup>a</sup> Et sic quatuor Synodos Sanctæ Universalis Ecclesiæ, sicut quatuor Libros Sancti Evangelii recipimus. Greg. M. Ep. 49. l. 2. p. 717. Edit. Froben. 1564.

gory the Great <sup>a</sup>) or which of them do constitute the Bishop of Rome Primate over the whole World, or Vicar of Christ, or Head of the whole Church, or Father and Doctour of all Christians, or do confess that Christ had intrusted him with the plenary Power of governing the Universal Church.

I will not trouble my self to shew in particular how such and such Canons place the Discipline of the Church in Provincial or Diocesan Synods, any one that looks into them will see these things evident enough: they therefore that talk of those Canons making the Bishop of Rome supreme, must either be such as never read them, or are men of no conscience and integrity.

<sup>b</sup> Published by Justel.

To put a quick end to this pretence, though I will not challenge our Compiler, because he perchance does not know what the Code of the Universal Church means, yet I do here challenge all the Romish Priests in England to shew me but one Canon in this Code <sup>b</sup> (which hath so great a number, no fewer than two hundred and seven Canons in it) that does constitute the Bishop of Rome Primate over the whole World, Head of the Catholick Church, and the Father and Doctour of all Christians; or confer upon him the full power of governing the whole Church: nay, farther, I challenge them to produce any Canon or Canons hence, that do assert that the Bishop of Rome is Primate over the whole World, Vicar of Christ, Head of the whole Church, Doctour of all Christians, and that he had the whole power of governing the Universal Church committed to him in St. Peter by our blessed Saviour. I will make one step farther; I challenge all of them to shew those Canons, or that Canon in this Code of the universal Church, which does suppose the Bishop of Rome to be either Primate over the World, Vicar of Christ, Head of the whole Church, Doctour of all Christians, or to have had the plenary power of governing the whole Church given him by Christ.

This challenge so fair, so plain and so full, I leave to the Reverend Fathers Consideration, and in the mean time I will take the liberty (since I have very good grounds for it) to declare and assert



assert to their as well as our people, that there is no Law of the Catholick Church for the first six hundred years, nor ever a Canon in the Code of the Laws of the universal Church, that does either constitute, or assert, or suppose the Bishop of Rome to be that Primate, Vicar, Head, Doctour and universal Pastour, which the Council of Florence says he is; and that the Council of Florence founding their Definition for the Pope's Supremacy upon the Acts and Canons of General Councils, were notoriously guilty either of ignorance or of forgery, either of which is more than sufficient to ruine their having any esteem from us: and as for the Title of Vicar of Christ, which they do now glory so much in, One of their own Communion, the Learned Monsieur Launoy<sup>c</sup> assures us, that for above a thousand years after Christ there was scarce a Bishop of Rome to be met with, who either said he was or wrote himself Vicar of Christ, so far were they in those days from thinking themselves to be the true or onely Vicars of Christ, their custome then being to write themselves Vicars of St. Peter.

<sup>c</sup> Launoy  
Ep. ad Mich.  
Marollium,  
p. 29. apud  
Par. 3. Epp.

#### SECT. IV.

These are some of the Reasons why we cannot believe or submit to the Papal Supremacy; if neither Scripture, nor the Laws of the universal Church be for it, we believe it is no crime in us not to be for it; if both Scripture and those Canons be directly against it, (as it hath in part, and might have been more fully shewn) it certainly is no sin in us to be against it too; nay, so far from being a sin, that it would be a very great one not to be so.

It will appear by this time, I believe, needles to most people to examine what our Compiler from F. Alexandre does produce from Antiquity to help out this groundless Supremacy: one advantage, I hope, I shall reap from what hath been observed hitherto on this head, that I need not at all be copious in the refusing his Testimonies which are brought to prove a Supremacy from St. Peter's being called by some Rock of the Church and Prince of the Apostles, from Appeals being made to the Bishops of Rome, and from the necessity of their confirming all Councils to make them obligatory to the Church. I shall inform the Reader, before I begin with the particular Testimonies of our Compiler, that they are generally stolen from Natalis Alexandre's fourth Dissertation in his *Pars prima Seculi primi*.

His

<sup>a</sup> *Nubes Test.*  
P. 22. ex Nat.  
Alexand.  
p. 297.

His first Testimony from Irenæus is of no use <sup>a</sup>, since it onely proves that there was a Church planted at Rome by the joint endeavours of St. Peter and St. Paul, which passage makes directly against a Supremacy, except our Compiler can prove that St. Peter and St. Paul were but one individual man: as to the potentior Principalitas there, they have been told often enough, that it relates to the Civil State, Rome being the Imperial City, whither business brought all people, Christians as well as others. The next ob-

<sup>b</sup> *Nub. Testium*, p. 23, 24. Nat. Alex. Pars secunda Seculi quarti, p. 225. cum Pars prima Seculi primi, p. 283.

scure passage from Optatus <sup>b</sup> doth indeed seem to prove that there is but one Cathedra in the World possessed by St. Peter, and after him by his Successors at Rome: but I have these objections against Optatus taken in this sense;

first, that he is made to contradict himself, since in his first Book against this same Parmenian <sup>c</sup> he speaks of the Cathedra of St. Cyprian, as well as of that of St. Peter; and in the same Book, against the same Schismatick, shewing how the people stuck to Cæcilian against Majorinus, he tells him <sup>d</sup>, that the Church was full of people, where the Episcopall Cathedra was, and the Altar whereon Cyprian, Lucian, and other peaceable Bishops, had offered: that the Donatists were Schismaticks, who separated from the Church, and set up Altar against Altar. Secondly, That he is made to contradict all Church Writers before and after him for

hundreds of years, who make as many Cathedra's as Bishops in the World; and every of these Bishops to be Successors to the Apostles, who had committed to them in common by our Saviour the Care and Government of the Catholick Church; as I have fully shewn above. I will name but one Father, and he an African too, Ter-

<sup>e</sup> *Percurre Ecclesias Apostolicas, apud quas ipse adhuc Cathedra Apostolorum sui loci presidentur: --proxima est tibi Achaia, habes Corinthum--Philippos--Thessalonicenses--Ephesum--Romam. Tert. de Prescrip. c. Hæret. c. 36.*

tullian, who bids <sup>e</sup> the Hereticks take a view of all the Apostolick Churches, in which the very Chairs the Apostles used are possessed by the Bishops in their several places, after which he reckons Corinth and Philippi, Thessalonica and Ephesus, and Rome it self. So that I think it plain enough, that there were other Cathedra's besides that at Rome, and therefore that cannot be the

only one; and this makes me farther wonder at what Optatus talks about



*Canons* were admitted to no Authority in the Church, because they were not admitted into the Code of the universal Church, which is answer sufficient to our Compiler, who pretends to prove this Supremacy from the first six Centuries. I will onely remark, that if the *Sardican Synod*. could, or did take away from *Constantine* the Emperor the power of granting the revising and rehearing of Causes which had been already judged in Provincial Synods, because he was an *Arian*, It should not upon the same reasons have granted or given that power to the Bishops of Rome, since the very next Bishop to *Julius* turned *Arian*, *Liberius* who confirmed the Council of *Sirmium*, and during his Exile before his *Arianism*, *Felix* who

<sup>m</sup> D. Hieron. Catalogus Scriptorum Illust. in Acacio, p. 297, 298. T. 1. Edit. Basil. 1555.

was put into his place was an *Arian* also, as *St. Hierom* doth assure us <sup>m</sup>; so that in endeavouring to avoid one Rock, they split upon another. The best answer any one can make

for these their Canons is, that they were onely a present temporary provision limited to *Julius* his time, who was a Catholic, against *Constantine*, who was an *Arian*.

<sup>n</sup> Nubes Test. p. 25. Nat. Alex. p. 298.

The next instance <sup>n</sup> about *Irenaeus* his writing to *Victor*, with *F. Alexander's* silly Remarks before and after it, is so far from being for, that it is one of the clearest instances in Antiquity against the Pope's Supremacy: When the Controversie about the celebration of Easter began to grow warm, there were several Synods gathered about it in Palestine, Pontus, Rome, France,

<sup>o</sup> Euseb. Hist. Eccles. l. 5. c. 23. Edit. Valef.

<sup>p</sup> Συμβολὴ δὲ τῆς Συνελευσεως Ἐπισκόπων ἐπὶ τ' αὐτῷ ἔγενοντο. Πάντες τε μὴ γνόντες δι' ὁμοταλαῶν Ἐκκλησιαστικῶν Δόγμα τις παλαιότερα διατηρούτο, ὡς αὐτὸν δ' ἐν αὐτῇ περὶ τῆς Κυριακῆς ἡμέρας τε τῆς ἑκταρῆς ἀναστῆναι ὁμοτελοῦτο τῇ Κυρίᾳ Μυστήριον. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. l. 5. c. 23.

and other places, and from them all together, not from the Bishop of Rome or his Synod, did proceed <sup>p</sup> the Ecclesiastical Rule of celebrating Easter onely on the Lord's day. This Rule or Determination it is probable *Victor* was desired to transmit to the Asiatics, thereby to bring them to a consent in practice in this Thing. The Asiatics refused upon the grounds set down in *Polycrates* his Letter to the Bishop and Church of Rome; which was so highly relented by *Victor*,

that he immediately does that which he seems to have threatned them with before in his Letter to them, and excommunicates the Asiatick Churches. This practice of his was so far from being consented to, or approved by those Bishops who were agreeing with him about the matter of the time of keeping Easter, that they all immediately <sup>q</sup> fell upon him for his extravagant irregular action, and

<sup>q</sup> Euseb. Hist. Eccles. l. 5. c. 24.

and do not onely exhort him, as *Valesius* translates, but command him (as I think a compound from *καταδουαι* ought to be translated) to mind those things that are for promoting Peace, Unity and Charity towards their neighbours; and *Eusebius* tells us in the same place, that several of those Letters were to be seen in his time, wherein the Bishops had so severely checkt and reprehended this Bishop of Rome, and he puts down part of that from *Irenaeus*, which *F. Alexandre* and our Compiler make use of. I think this behaviour does not very clearly prove the Supremacy of the Pope, and this would certainly have been very unaccountable carriage towards Christ's True Vicar, who had full power of governing the whole Church: the truth is, they knew of no such person in those days, he was not born into the world till near a Thousand years after them.

But says our Compiler from *F. Alexandre* (and this is a pert saying among a great many among us) *Irenaeus* does not deny the Bishop of Rome's power of Excommunicating the Asiatics: it is true, he does not, and which is more, he could not, since every Bishop in the Catholick Church, and therefore he at Rome among the rest, might deny to communicate with any other Bishop or Church, against which they thought they had sufficient reason for such a suspension of Communion.

One thing however I would commend to his and *F. Alexandre's* consideration, and that is, that this Action of Victor's was so little valued in the Catholick Church, that it does not appear that any Christians did thereupon refuse Communion with the Asiatics; which is a great commendation truly of that Bishop's management, but a certain evidence of the Opinion of the Ecclesiasticks of those days concerning the Bishop of Rome's Power.

The next Quotation <sup>r</sup> from *St. Basil's* Comments *ad cap. 2. Nubes T.* *Isaie* is not from *F. Alexandre*, so that here our Compiler doubtless p. 25, 26.

would take it amiss, if he be not allowed to have something of his own, and to have perused *St. Basil* for example; but the great unhappiness is, that he must not be allowed it, since he either borrowed this passage from some other friend, or made it himself, there being no such passage in that Commentary of this Father upon the second of *Isaiah*; and which is more unhappy still, there is the direct contrary to it, for *St. Basil* <sup>c</sup> speaking of the Church of God, that its Foundations are upon the Holy Mountains, says that *St. Peter* is one of <sup>f</sup> — in Domo Dei qua est Ecclesia Dei viventis, cuius Fundamenta in Montibus Sanctis:  
*est enim adificata supra Fundamentum Apostolorum & Prophetarum, unus ex Montibus erat Petrus, &c.* *St. Basil.* in cap. 2. *Esa.* Vol. 1. p. 869. Edit. Par. 1618.



those Mountains, and that the Church of God is built upon the Foundation of the Apostles and Prophets.

\* Nub. Test.

p. 26.

N. Alex.

p. 304, 305.

As the first passage is guilty of falsehood, so the second \* from St. Basil is guilty of very egregious dissimulation. Certainly F. Alexandre borrowed this passage from some such Writer as Bellarmine, and never consulted the Epistle it self, or he could not have been guilty of such dissimulating dealing: had he read the Epistle, he might have seen, that as it is directed to the Western Bishops, so it did desire from them (not from the Bishop of Rome onely, or more than the rest) help and assistance in their present afflictions caused by this Eustathius and others. There are two reasons set down in the

\* Eustathius his business to Rome was not to appeal, but as Legate from the Synod of Lamplacius (as Du Pin assures us, Dissert. 2. p. 163.) to draw Liberius to communicate with the Semiarians.

Epistle, why they did desire this help, the first of them is because that Eustathius \* coming to Rome, and having imposed upon Liberius and the Western Bishops (in Synod perhaps) with him so far as to be admitted to communion, had obtained their Communicatory Letter to testify the Orthodoxy of his Faith, upon his producing of which to the Synod of Tyana he had been re-

stored, and thence had the opportunity of ravaging the Churches, and dispersing his Impieties, and therefore they desire that as their Letter was the cause of his being restored, and thereby enabled to do them such mischief, so they would from thence \* vouchsafe them a Cure for this spreading Evil: the other reason is, because that what they at home said against Eustathius was said to proceed from a private pique or a contentious humour \*, and therefore St. Basil in their name desires their Letter who lived so far off, and would thereupon be considered as disinterested persons, and have the greater credit

\* Quoniam igitur isthinc vires accepit ledendi Ecclesias, ac publicanda sua impietatis fiducia, quam VOS dedistis, among their people.

ad subversionem multorum usus est, necesse est ut isthinc quoque veniat malorum istorum correctio, scribaturque Ecclesiis, quibus quidem conditionibus ad Communionem susceptus sit: simul vero adjiciatur, quomodo jam immutata sententia gratiam à PATRIBUS, qui tum erant, acceptam irritam reddat. S. Basilii Ep. 74. ad Occident. Episcopos. p. 875, 876. Edit. Par. 1618.

\* Qua nos enim loquimur, multis suspecta sunt, quasi propter privatas quasdam contentiones meorum, ac pusillanimitatem illis incutere velimus. Vos vero, quanto ab illis habitatione remotiores estis, tanto plus apud plebem habetis fidei. Idem Ibidem. p. 874.

I appeal to any man of sense, whether any thing can be more evident than that it was not Liberius alone who gave Eustathius that unhappy Letter; and that the Community of Western Bishops were desired (not he at Rome alone) to help them in their distress; and

and lastly, that they desired *this help*, not because they had not power enough of their own to have judged and deposed *Enstatius*, but because they were desirous to use the least invidious Method of ridding their Communion of him by getting a great number of the Western Bishops to condemn his Opinions, and to exhort the faithful not to communicate any longer with him. Had our Compiler but translated the two words *Occidentales Episcopus* in the beginning of this Testimony, there are few Readers, but would have seen the cheat.

The next Testimony of Gregory Nazianzen's <sup>y</sup>, which says the <sup>y</sup> *Nub. Test.* faith confessed by St. Peter was the foundation of the Church, ought in prudence to have been omitted, since it is directly against our Compiler: the next passage from him does not concern the Bishop of Rome (as our Compiler <sup>z</sup> from F. Alexandre does most falsely assert) <sup>z</sup> *Nub. Test.* but St. Basil, as Elias Cretensis, and Billius in their Comments upon *N. Alex.* him assure us. *p. 289, 290.*

The following story about Dionysius of Alexandria is nothing to our Compiler <sup>a</sup> or F. Alexandre's purpose, since here is nothing done, but what any Bishop might have done, and which is more, nothing done by the Bishop of Rome himself, but by a Synod then met, when the complaint was made against Dionysius, and all the share the Bishop of Rome hath in this affair (besides his suffrage) is onely to be the Synods Secretary in drawing up this Letter, and sending their Opinion <sup>b</sup> to his name-sake at Alexandria: and therefore our Compiler is very much to be blamed, but F. Alexandre much more for their impertinent, and false accounts prefixed to this passage from Athanasius.

Πάντων γινώσκων γεγραπὴν περὶ τῶν ἐκείνου ἐκείνου. D. Athan. de Synod. Arimin. & Seleuc. *p. 707. Edit. Commel. 1600.*

What credit in Ecclesiastical History Natalis Alexandre may have beyond Sea, I cannot tell; if all his twenty five Volumes be of the same strain with his first, I must needs say that he was fitter to write Romances than Church-History, for certainly no man (whose talent does not lie wonderfully that way) could with so much art have dressed up the story about Dionysius, or with so much address and formality have told the next story of Julius's taking the Cause of Athanasius into his hands, and of his citing him and his enemies to appear before his Apostolick Tribunal, and yet ground this formal story upon a bit of Julius's Letter (as he calls it) to the Orientals,

which hath not *one syllable* of any such thing in it: *first*, here is nothing here of *Julius's* taking the Cause of *Athanasius* into his own hands, but the contrary to it is evident from *Sozomen*, who writes that, upon the *Eusebians* prevailing against the *Orthodox Bishops* in the *East*, and deposing them, all the *Western Bishops* (He at *Rome* among the rest) did very kindly receive *Athanasius* when he came into the *West*, and did take upon themselves the bearing and Judgment of his Cause: *secondly* it is as false that there is in this Letter any citation of *St. Athanasius* and the *Oriental*s before the *Apostolick Tribunal*. As false as this account is, our *Compiler*<sup>d</sup> ventures upon *F. Alexandre's* credit to transcribe and vend it for true History, and which is more to add to it, by telling us that *Athanasius* appealed (upon his deposition by the *Eusebians*) unto the *Bishop of Rome*; whereas his own Master *F. Alexandre* puts it down for his first Conclusion (in his Dissertation concerning the Cause of *Athanasius*) that *Athanasius* did not appeal to *Julius Bishop of Rome*: nay his own next Testimony from *Sozomen* says that *Julius*, being satisfied<sup>e</sup> there was no safety for *Athanasius* in *Ægypt*, invited him to *Rome*, which is evidence enough he had not appealed thither.

What our *Compiler* designs from this passage about *Athanasius*, and the three next Testimonies from *Sozomen*<sup>g</sup>, *Socrates*<sup>h</sup> and *Theodoret*<sup>i</sup> is to shew the custome of Appeals to the *Pope*. In answer to which I say, first that there is no evidence that *Athanasius* did appeal to the *Pope*; next I say that this Letter drawn up by *Julius* was in the name (and therefore spoke the sense) of a Synod of *Western Bishops* at *Rome*; this thing *Athanasius* himself informs us of, for after he hath put down the Letter (penned by *Julius*) to

the *Oriental*s, he says that after that the Synod at *Rome*<sup>b</sup> had wrote that Letter by *Julius* the *Roman Bishop*, the *Eusebians* still persisted in disturbing the Churches; farther, it is evident from this Synodical Epistle (as I hope I may now call

it) that *Julius* did not pretend to any Judgment of the cause himself in particular as *Bishop of Rome*, which our *Compiler* from *F. Alexandre* doth very falsely assert, since in this Letter the complaint is, that the *Oriental*s had in this affair about *Athanasius* acted against Canon, in that they had not written to all the *Western Bishops* (*πάντοι ἑκείν*<sup>i</sup> are their own words, which according to our wise Guide and his Transcriber must be translated, to the *Bishop of Rome*) that so it might have been determined by all together, *Occidentals* as well

<sup>c</sup> Sozom.  
Hist. Eccl.  
l. 3. c. 7.  
Edit. Valef.  
<sup>d</sup> Nubes Test.  
p. 28, 29.  
Nat. Alex.  
p. 302, 303.

<sup>e</sup> Nat. Alex.  
Dissert. 21.  
in Pars 3.  
Sec. 4. p. 329.  
<sup>f</sup> Sozom. H.  
E. l. 3. c. 10.  
Edit. Valef.  
<sup>g</sup> Nub. Test.  
p. 22, 29, 30.  
Nat. Alex.  
p. 302, 303.

<sup>h</sup> Ταῦτα τῆς ἐν Παρίσι Συνόδου  
καὶ τῶν ΔΙ' Ἰουλίῳ τῷ Ἐπι-  
σκοπῷ Παρίσι, &c. D. Athan. A-  
polog. 2. p. 587.

<sup>i</sup> Idem Ibi-  
dem. p. 586.  
B.

as *Oriental* what was just and necessary in this affair: lastly, (as I partly observed above) the *Bishop* of *Rome* was so far from being owned or thought the sole Judge in this affair, that *Sozomen* tells us <sup>k</sup> that upon *St. Athanasius*, and the other *Bishops* being deposed by the *Eusebian* Faction, the *Bishop* of *Rome*, and all the *Western Bishops* look upon these practices of the *Eusebians* as wrongs done to themselves, and therefore did receive *St. Athanasius*, who came to them, very kindly, and took upon themselves the hearing and judging of his Cause.

This was such a mortification to *Eusebius* (the Ring-leader of the *Arian* Faction) to see *Athanasius* received to Communion, and the hearing of his Cause espoused by the Body of the *Western Bishops*, that he <sup>l</sup> wrote to *Julius* of *Rome*, that he would take upon himself to be Judge of what had past against *Athanasius* at *Tyre*: the design of which Letter could certainly be no other, than either to make a Division among the *Western Bishops*, if the *Bishop* of *Rome* should hearken to such a thing, or to have served for a pretence to have thrown out *Athanasius* again, should he be restored by the *Bishop* of *Rome's* Sentence, when opportunity served; because this Judgment would have been against the Laws of the Church which appoints such Judgments to be managed Synodically.

*Socrates* and *Sozomen* upon this business speak of a Canon (which the present Writers of the Church of *Rome* urge often enough) that no Acts of the Church should be valid, which were made without the Approbation of the *Bishop* of *Rome*: They both seem to ground what they write upon *Julius's* Letter to the *Oriental*s, and upon that passage in it, wherein *Julius* asks them, whether they did not know, that the Custom is, that we ought first to be written to, that what was just might be determined hence <sup>m</sup>: if They did ground their words upon that Letter they are guilty of two great mistakes, first, in saying there was such a Canon, whereas the Letter it self pretends to no more, than that there was such a Custom: secondly, They are much more mistaken in thinking the Letter to be *Julius* his own, when as it was a Syno-

—Καθημεριον τῆς σπ.δ.π. περιλαμβανον ἀνα τὴν ἐν τῷ τῷ ἐν Νικαίᾳ βεβαωμένην Σύνοδον — ὁ δὲ Ῥωμαίων Ἐκκλησίας ἐπιτετιμῶν, καὶ ὁ ἀνὰ τὸ Δύον ἱερεῖς, ὅτε ἐν οὐκίᾳ ταῦτα ἡγῶντο — ἀποκρίσας τῷ ὡς αὐτοῦ Ἀθανασίῳ, εὐχαρίστας ἐδίδαντο, καὶ ΠΡΟΣ ἈΤΤΟΥΣ καὶ ἑστ' ἈΤΤΟΝ ἄλλων ΔΙ' ἑκὼν. *Sozom. H. E. l. 3. c. 7. Edit. Val.*

Ἐπὶ τούτοις ὁ χαλεπὸς οἶκον Ἐπιστολῆς, ἡμεῖς ἰδὼν ὅτι ἈΤΤΟΝ γενομένης Κελεύει καὶ ἐπὶ Ἀθανασίῳ δεξαίτων ἐν Τύρῳ. *Idem Ibidem.*

— Ἐδὲ καὶ τῇ Ἐκκλησιᾳ καὶ καθόλου, καὶ μὴ ὅπως γεγενημένη καὶ κείνη· ἵνα ἡμεῖς παρὰ πάντων δεῖται τὸ δίκαιον. *Ep. Synod. apud Athan. Apol. 2. p. 586.*

dical

dical Letter penn'd onely by *Julius*, and by *ut primum NOBIS scribatur* was meant the *Western Bishops* whose the Letter was, and not *Julius* the *Bishop of Rome* in particular.

<sup>n</sup> Launoi  
Ep. ad Jac.  
Bevilaquam  
p. 259, &c.  
273. in Part.  
6. Ep.

This answer I think is fair and sufficient, but if any one will notwithstanding this have *Julius* to speak here of *himself*, I refer him for an answer (not *very creditable* to that *Bishop*) unto the Learned *Monsieur Launoy*, who <sup>n</sup> will shew him, that *Julius* went upon a great mistake, since there is no Canon in the Code of the Universal Church, nor in the ancient Code of the Church of Rome, that makes any mention of such a thing.

<sup>o</sup> Nubes Test.  
p. 30, 31.  
Nat. Alex.  
p. 303, 304.  
<sup>p</sup> Valefii Observa-  
tiones  
Eccles. in  
Socr. & So-  
zom. l. 2. c. 3.

The next Testimony of the Pope's Authority in restoring *Paulus* of *Constantinople*, *Asclepas* and others to their *Bishopricks* is taken from *Socrates* and *Sozomen* <sup>o</sup>. How far from accurate in these affairs those two *Historians* are, I have just shewn, and how little they are to be followed or credited in this account about *Paulus* is what the Learned *Valefius* in his *Observationes Ecclesiasticae* <sup>p</sup> upon them hath made apparent from *St. Athanasius*, whose Authority in this business must be of infinitely greater value than *Socrates* and *Sozomen*, since He lived at the very same time, and they two so many years after this business. There is no evidence in Antiquity that

<sup>q</sup> Vide Valefii Observationes Eccles. in Socrat. & Soz. l. 2. c. 6.

<sup>r</sup> Καὶ τὸ δὲ ἀποστρέφειν τὸν ἐξωλεσμένον [viz. *Paulus CP.*] καὶ καὶσχυρῶς τὸ δὲ ἀποστρέφειν καὶ καὶσχυρῶς ἀποστρέφειν οὐδὲν αἰσίων ἐστίν—ἐξωλεσμένον, καὶ ἐκείνου αἰς τὸ ἐπισκοπεῖν αὐτὸν. D. Athan. Ep. ad Solitar. Vit. agentes. p. 630.

these *Bishops* appealed to the *Bishop of Rome*: it is very plain from *Athanasius* <sup>q</sup> that these *Historians* give a false account of the several banishments and restitutions of *Paulus* for example, and it is as certain from him <sup>r</sup> that *Paulus* could not come to *Rome*, nor was restored by *Julius*, since *Constantius* had in this his third exile put him in chains, and banished him to *Singara* in *Me-sopotamia*, and afterwards removed him to *Emesa*; so that he could not be at *Rome*, nor be restored by that *Bishop* (upon his Profession of

the *Nicene Faith*, as *Sozomen* tells the story). He that will compare *Athanasius*, and these two *Historians*, will find perfect Confusion in the latter; but if he grudge so much pains, he may find it very sufficiently done by *Valefius* in his second Book of *Ecclesiastical Observations* upon these two *Historians*.

<sup>s</sup> Nub. Test.  
p. 31, 32.  
<sup>t</sup> p. 25.  
<sup>v</sup> Nub. Test.  
p. 32, 33.  
N. Alex.  
p. 307, 308.

The next quotations from *St. Chrysostome* <sup>t</sup> are onely some of his Rhetorical flights, his Opinion against any Superiority in *St. Peter* over the rest of the *Apostles* we have had above <sup>u</sup>. I will pass therefore to his Letter of Request (forsooth) to *Innocent* the First <sup>v</sup>, that

he



he would repeal the Sentence of the Synod ad Quercum against him, and order him to be restored to his See. But how little this History helps the Papal Supremacy, these few Observations will shew.

First, that Chrysostome did appeal from that Synod ad Quercum (not to the Bishop of Rome, which they of his Communion should prove, but) to a General Council, as is apparent not onely from Sozomen \* but from this Epistle it self \* to Innocent. Secondly, that Chrysostome sent the same Epistle to Venerius Bishop of Milain, and to Chromatius of Aquileia †: so that if this Epistle prove any Prerogative for Innocent, it will prove the same for Venerius and Chromatius, and that I am sure is no help towards a Supremacy. Thirdly, That this Letter was not sent to Innocent in particular, but to some other Bishops ‡ with him, which I take to be the Bishops of his Diocese, (as the Letter to Venerius did, I suppose, concern the Bishops of his Diocese, and that to Chromatius all that were under his Jurisdiction) and therefore yields no assistance towards the proving a particular Prerogative for Innocent in this case. Fourthly, That Innocent did not pretend to give Judgment in the Quarrels betwixt St. Chrysostome, and Theophilus, but told St. Chrysostome §, that there must be a Synod, which neither side could take exceptions at, of Oriental and Occidental Bishops together to put an end to this business: upon which account Innocent did request of Honorius to call a Western Council, which the Emperour ¶ readily did, and this Synod did beseech the Emperour to write to his Brother Arcadius, that he would appoint a General Synod at Thessalonica, where the Western and Eastern Bishops might meet and pass a final Judgment upon this Affair of St. Chrysostome.

\* Sozomen. H. E. l. 8. c. 17. Edit. Vales.

† — ac mille appellante Judices — et paratum, presente orbe universo, quaque objecta diluere.

D. Chryl. Ep. apud Palladium de Vita Chryl. p. 5. in T. 2. Chryl. Edit. Duc.

‡ Scriptimus ista et ad Venerium Mediolanensem et ad Chromatium Aquilegiensem Episcopum.

Vale in Domino. Idem Ibidem.

§ Hac igitur cogitantes omnia, Domini beatissimi ac Reverendissimi dignum vestra constantia et congruum robur, ac studium sumite. — Ne igitur immanis ista confusio cuncta percurrat — scribite precor, et auctoritate vestra decernite, &c. Idem Ibidem.

¶ Ad hac rescripsit — Innocentius — dicens, oportere consilium aliam irreprehensibilem Synodum Occidentalium et Orientalium Sacerdotum, cedentibus Concilio amicis primum, deinde inimicis: Neutrarum quippe partium, ut plurimum, rectum esse Judicium. Innoc. Ep. apud Palladium. Ibidem c. 3.

¶ Non tulit ultra Innocentius Pontifex, indignitate summâ permotus, scripsitque ad Honorium Imperatorem. — Motus his literis Princeps præcepit Synodum Occidentalium Episcoporum congregari, et cum in unam sententiam concurrisset, ad se referre. Congregati Italix Episcopi Imperatorem orant, ut scriberet Arcadio Fratri suo, ut juberet Thessalonica Concilium fieri, quo facilius possent utraque partes Orientis Occidentisque concurrere. Palladius in Vita D. Chrysost. p. 6. in T. 2. Operum Chrysost. Edit. Ducæi.

How far *this Account* is from proving any thing extraordinary about *Innocent* is what the meanest Reader will readily apprehend. I will not inquire of our *Compiler*, because I believe he knows nothing of the business, but I do of *Father Alexandre* in what Edition of *St. Chrysostome* he found this Epistle called *Libellus Supplex*, and where he read that *St. Chrysostome* presented it (upon his knees I suppose they would have it, as *Letters of Requests* use to be) to *Innocent*; for that must be the sense of *F. Alexandre's* porrexit *Innocentio I. Pontifici Romano*: I desire our *Compiler* to send *F. Alexandre* word, that *He* that will be guilty of such tricks, must either be no Scholar, or no honest Man.

\* Nub. Test.

P. 33.

N. Alex.

P. 298, 299.

\* P. 22.

\* Nub. Test.

P. 33, 34.

N. Alex.

P. 307.

\* — Cum sancta Synodus cognitionis fuit unanimis tua, Ceterisque ex Aegypto Confacerdotibus nostris commiserit, &c. Ambros. Ep. 78. T. 3. p. 233. Edit. Froben. 1538.

The two next Authorities from *Vincentius*, and *St. Ambrose* <sup>c</sup> are of too little value to deserve much consideration, that of *Lirinenfis* supposes other Bishops to have equal share in the Care of the Church, while it calls them the Collegues of the Bishop of Rome; and for *St. Ambrose* about feeding the sheep, that Text hath been sufficiently secured, and cleared above <sup>d</sup>: and I need be no longer upon the next passage from his Epistle to *Theophilus*, but that I cannot pass over the ignorance and dissingenuity of our *Compiler* and his Master *F. Alexandre* upon this point <sup>e</sup>: They tell us, that the Synod of *Capua* did commit to *Theophilus* the decision of the quarrel betwixt *Evaristus* and *Flavianus* at *Antioch*; which is very false, for it is expressed as plain in this Epistle, as words can do it, that the decision of that business was committed to *Theophilus* and the *Agyptian Bishops* <sup>f</sup> who were in Synod to determine that affair: They tell us also that *St. Ambrose* owns that *Theophilus* ought to give an account of his Decision (not of the Cause, as our *Compiler* mistakes his Master) to the See Apostolick, and that his Decision would be of no force or obligation, if the Bishop of Rome did not ratifie it; the folly of which is sufficiently exposed from the Determination of the Synod of *Capua* it self, which utterly ruins this foolish talk, when it did commit the final Decision of that business to a Synod of *Agyptian Bishops*, without taking the least notice of the Bishop of Rome; and they have as little ground, for what they so boldly affirm here, from *St. Ambrose's* Epistle, since all that *St. Ambrose* (who had been consulted in the business by *Theophilus*) directs here is that his opinion is that they would advise with the Bishop of Rome in this affair; that so what was decided by them in Synod, might have a general reception.

His

His next Authorities are much more unfit for the proving such great things as the Florentine Council says of the Pope : none but a very short-sighted person would quote the Comparison of St. Peter and Plato ( which passage is not in St. Hierome as set down by our Author ) since no one ever made or believed Plato to be such a Prince over the Philosophers, as the Church of Rome says St. Peter was over the Apostles and the whole Church <sup>g</sup>. The business of the Council of Jerusalem, with St. Hierome's leave, makes more for the honour of St. James, Bishop there, than of St. Peter, since he concluded the debates, and the Canon was drawn up in the very expressions prescribed by him : and I must confess that, as to the next passage from St. Hierome <sup>h</sup> about a Head constituted among the Apostles, since I find nothing in the Gospels or in the Acts of the Apostles that either our Saviour did appoint, or the Apostles elect or constitute Peter Head of the Apostles ; I cannot believe it, though St. Hierome doth affirm it, especially since his being made the Apostles Messenger, Acts 8. 14. is so home an Evidence against it.

The next Testimony <sup>i</sup> proves only that St. Hierome acted as every good Christian ought, in keeping to the Faith and Church of Christ, against the Hereticks, that he acted as every Presbyter ought, when he consulted his own Bishop, whether he might use the term Hypostases about the Trinity. The two last Testimonies from him do not deserve a word of answer, and therefore I will pass to those from St. Austin ; the two first <sup>k</sup> passages from whom are directly against our Compiler ; the rest are too weak for his designs, and to very little purpose, since as to the first <sup>l</sup> of them, several other Churches as well as that at Rome did enjoy the prerogative of having an Apostolical Chair ; and as to the next <sup>m</sup>, it was very expedient the Africans should try all means, and use all helps that could be got to suppress a growing Heresie ; and for the third <sup>n</sup>, it was customary enough for other Bishops to call Bishops to Synods, the History of the first ages, of St. Cyprian in particular, will put this out of doubt ; the last <sup>o</sup> falls in with the second, and therefore I pass it, and ought to do so by those of St. Cyril, since they <sup>p</sup> were answered sufficiently above in the Interpretation of the Rock.

Having spent so much time about the Testimonies hitherto, I will make the more haste through the rest ; there are but one or two left that can give us much occasion of an Answer ; that about Nestorius had need to have a Preface to make it look great for the Pope, as if Nestorius could not be excommunicated but by

Nub. Testim.  
p. 34.

g Nub. Test.  
p. 34, 35.  
Nat. Alex.  
p. 281, 282.

h Nub. Test.  
p. 35.  
Nat. Alex.  
p. 283.

i Nub. Test.  
p. 35.  
Nat. Alex.  
Par. 2. Sec. 4.  
p. 190.

k Nub. Test.  
p. 37.  
Nat. Alex.  
p. 284.

l Nub. Test.  
p. 39.  
Nub. Test.  
p. 39, 40.  
Nat. Alex.  
p. 308.

m Nub. Test.  
p. 40.  
Nat. Alex.  
p. 309.

n Nub. Test.  
p. 40, 41.  
Nat. Alex.  
p. 309.  
p Nub. Test.  
p. 41.

his Authority; and Cyril did excommunicate him by virtue onely of the power given him by that Pope 9: whereas it is certain from Saint Cyril's own Letter to Cælestine, that before then, (upon Dorotheus his having denounced in the presence of Nestorius an Anathema<sup>r</sup> against all that should say the Virgin Mary was the Mother of God) not onely the people of Constantinople, but almost all the Monasteries with their Abbats had left off communicating with Nestorius, and that St. Cyril himself had already broke off Communion with him, but does not publickly denounce Excommunication against Nestorius,

Ἡ οὐ πείτεται ὁ ἱερεὺς αὐτὸν  
κινουμένη ἐκβιβάζουσαν αὐτοῦ ΜΕ-  
ΤΑ ΠΑΡΗΣΤΑΣ, πλὴν ἐν  
ταῦτα τῇ οἱ θεοσεβείᾳ ἀνακινῶν.  
σιμῆδα. Idem, Ibid.

Ἡ τῶν ὧν ἡΜΕΙ Σ — ἀ-  
ποκινῶμεν Ὁ ΦΕΙΔΟΜΕΝ —  
ἐν δὲ τῇ παλαιᾷ διατάξει κατ'  
αὐτῶν — συναρθεῖσιν ΣΟΙ τοῖς  
νῦν ἱερεσὶ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἡμετέρων δε-  
ρε, &c. Cælest. Ep. Cyrillo.

<sup>r</sup> Nubes Testium, p. 42, 43.  
Nat. Alexan. p. 310, 311, 312.

<sup>s</sup> Nubes Testium, p. 44.  
Nat. Alexan. p. 312.

lentinian's Letter, which speaks of the Bishop of Rome's having power to judge of Matters of Faith and the Cause of Priests or Bishops.

<sup>r</sup> Nub. Test.  
p. 44, 45.

I onely ask our Compiler<sup>s</sup>, whether he designs from this passage to prove that the Bishop of Rome had such a power of judging Matters of Faith, and the Causes of the Clergy alone, or in Conjunction with other Bishops: if he designs onely the latter, no body does oppose a Synod's having power of judging and examining such things; but if he will have the Bishop of Rome alone to have full power over such Matters and Controversies, I cannot but refer him to his own Master F. Alexandre, who was so earnest and so vigorous to have the Proposition censured (which is in the Hungari-

See Nouvelles de la Republ. des  
Lettres for the Month October,  
1684. p. 262.

an Censure of the Propositions of the Clergy of France) which teaches, that it doth belong to the Apostolical See alone by divine  
immutable

immutable <sup>a</sup> privilege to determine in Controversies of Faith: against which extravagant Proposition it is said that Father made a Discourse of two hours long, which pleased Monsieur Colbert so well, that he sent him a present of a hundred Loui-

dores. This Doctrine of the sole power of the Pope in judging Controversies of Faith is so odious to the Clergy of France that they call it the Heresie of the Jesuites; and the Sorbonists, who wrote the Notes upon the Hungarian Censure of the four Propositions of the Gallican Clergy, tell the Clergy <sup>a</sup> of Hungary, that

there is nothing so directly contrary to the most plain words of Scripture, to the most evident Testimonies of the Fathers, and the Practice of the whole Catholick Church for above a thousand years, as the Doctrine of the Pope's having sole power in

judging Controversies of Faith; so that, I hope, if I cannot, those Authorities may convince our Compiler, that he had better let this Testimony alone. I will pass the two next Testimonies, and tell our Compiler, that, as to the Council of Constantinople, they did not submissively desire (as our Compiler <sup>b</sup> and F. Alexandre do most falsely assert they did) the Confirmation of their Decrees from Damascus, Bishop of Rome: there is nothing in this Epistle of Damascus to ground such a thing on; and, which is more, it is certain that they did desire of the Emperour Theodosius <sup>c</sup>, who had convened this Council, that HE would confirm their Decrees.

<sup>a</sup> Ad solam Sedem Apostolicam divino & immutabili privilegio spectat de Controversiis Fidei judicare.

<sup>a</sup> Note in Censuram Hungaricam Quatuor Propositionum Cleri Gallicani, p. 16. in Richerius's Vindicie Doctrinae Majorum Scholae Parisiensis.

<sup>b</sup> Nub. Test. p. 46. Nat. Alex. p. 306.

<sup>c</sup> A. P. 2. multa testis nichil

γενεσθαι κατ'εξουσιαν. Αδυναμειν τινος εστιν επιταγαι επιταγαις και συνταγαις και συνταγαις, ουκ εστιν δεξιον εμμεμεσις το τλη. Prothneticum Concilii C. P. Imper. Theodosio in T. 2. Concil. p. 943. Edit. Costart.

Thus I have gone through all the Testimonies collected by our Compiler, and, instead of answering the last, to wit, the Definition of the Council of Florence in the method I have done those hitherto, I will conclude against it, that as I have shewn above, that there was no ground from Scripture nor Canon of the Universal Church that did in the least countenance what the Council of Florence did define concerning the Pope; so neither doth any of the instances pickt up by our Compiler confirm or illustrate that Decree, and therefore we have reason to say that the Pope's Supremacy had neither countenance nor being during the first five hundred years after our Saviour.



## C H A P. III.

## Concerning Tradition.

## S E C T. I.

**T**HE business of *Tradition* is that which our *Compiler* undertakes next to defend: I cannot understand to what purpose *He* takes so much pains to tell us the *Gnosticks Heresie* with that of the *Marcionites* and *Valentinians*, since, I hope, none of those *Heresies* are chargeable now upon us, no not that worship of *Images* which was among the *Gnosticks*, and is to be heard of in a *Church* now in the *World*: we could wish all our *Neighbours* were as far from any thing bordering on those *Heresies*; we do heartily desire, that as they do not believe in *Thirty Gods*, with the *Valentinians*, so they were as far from having thrice thirty *Objects* of *Religious Worship*.

I heartily wish our *Compiler* had read that second Chapter of Saint

\* *Nubes Testium*, p. 48. *Nat. Alex. Dissertatio decima sexta adversus Valentinianum*, edyc. in *Par. Secunda Seculi secundæ*, p. 349.

*Irenæus* his third Book against the *Hereticks*, which he \* from *F. Alexandre* quotes to a very false purpose; if either *He* or *F. Alexandre* himself had read this third Book of *Irenæus*, had read but this second Chapter; nay more, but the

very Title of it; our *Compiler* would not have talked so filly about those *Hereticks* rejecting the received *Doctrines* and *Practices* of

\* *Nat. Alex. Ibidem*, p. 348. *Prænotandum tertio hanc fuisse Veterum Hæreticorum indolem ut solas ad Scripturas provocarent.*

the *Church*, because they pretended they were not in *Scripture*, nor *F. Alexandre* <sup>b</sup>, have put down such an egregious falsehood as to say, the *Hereticks*, in defence of their *Tenets*, appealed only to *Scripture*, when the very Title of this *Chap- us*, that the *Hereticks* would be ruled neither by *Scripture* nor *Tradition* in their *Disputes* with the *Church* \*.

very in *Irenæus* tells

\* *Quod neque Scripturis, neque Traditionibus, obsequantur hæretici. Titulus, c. 2. l. 3. Irenæi adv. Hæreses,*

I will set down here the beginning of the Chapter it self, because it is so like the prattle of a sort of people now in the *World*, who would be very angry to be cal- led

led Hereticks. When ( says Irenæus <sup>c</sup> ) you argue against these Hereticks from the Scriptures themselves, they quickly fall to accusing them, <sup>c</sup> *Cum enim ex Scripturis* that They are not right, that they are not of Authority, [ a Romanist *arguuntur, in* would have added, without our Church's approbation, ] that things *accusationem* are set down variously, and that there is no finding the Truth out of them *convertuntur* by those who are ignorant of Tradition, since It was delivered by Word *ipsarum Scri-* of mouth, not by Writing. *pturam,* *quasi non rec-*

*neque sint ex autoritate, & quia variè sint dicta, & quia non possit ex his inveniri veritas ab his,* *qui nesciant Traditionem.* Non enim per literas traditam illam, sed per vivam vocem. D. Irenæus adv. Hæreses, l. 3. c. 2. Edit. Fevarden.

But to proceed to his new point of Controversie <sup>d</sup>, our Compiler <sup>d</sup> *Nubes Test.* tells us, that the Fathers maintain, that the Tradition of the Catholick *p. 48.* Church is to be received, and that Her Constitutions and Practices are *Nat. Alexan.* not to be rejected, though not found expressly in Scripture. *p. 351.*

How loose a Writer our Compiler is, the World hath been sufficiently informed by the Answers to his other pieces; in this point He is resolved to act the same person, while he so gingerly puts down part of the Debate betwixt us, and suppresses the rest of it.

To state therefore the Controversie about Tradition ( if there really be any ) betwixt us, He should not have put down that for the account of the Debate herein betwixt us, which is agreed to by both sides, nor should have omitted that wherein we really disagree, and that is about the Scriptures being a certain and perfect Rule of Faith without the help of Tradition, which the Council of Trent hath made to be of Equal Authority with the Scripture.

What our Compiler hath set down is no Controversie betwixt us, since we do declare that the Tradition of the Catholick Church is to be received, we do own that by This we received the Holy Scriptures, and know how to separate the Scriptures from Apocryphal or Supposititious Writings; and we profess also that we are willing and ready to receive any Doctrine not written, that hath as perpetual, unanimous and certain a Tradition as the Doctrines written in Scripture have; that we onely wait for their proving that any of those Doctrines they would obtrude upon us have been thus Universally delivered: so that herein is no Controversie betwixt us; and if by Constitutions our Compiler means those about Matters of Discipline and Government, and by Practices the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church; He knows, or least ought to know, that it is the

the *Doctrine of our Church*, that there is *no necessity of expresse Scripture for the Constitutions and Practices* which *she* enjoins in order to the *more regular and decent service of God*. So that here again *He* sees we are agreed, and therefore what *he* hath put down here as a *Point* at present under debate betwixt us, is really none at all.

But if *He* mean here *Constitutions of Points of Faith* necessary to Salvation, let *him* undertake to produce *Fathers* (when he pleases) for that point, and I do here promise him an *Answer*: what *He* hath collected under this head are not to that purpose.

\* Nubes Test.

p. 48, 49.

Nat. Alexan.

p. 358---360.

For as to his two <sup>e</sup> first Authorities from *Irenaus*, they are taken out of that very book wherein *St. Irenaus* (as he tells him who put him upon writing against the *Valentinians*) undertook to confute that *Heresie* from <sup>f</sup> the *Scriptures* themselves. I wish some in the World would but imitate him, and not be angry at us for being solicitous and earnest for the same Method. In this Book *Irenaus* takes notice of the extravagant humour of the *Hereticks*, that they would

be confined to no Rule, nor submit either to *Scripture* or *Tradition*.

g D. Iren. l. 3. tion 8.

c. 2.

By *Tradition* here this *Father* meant the preaching of the *Christian Faith*, and the *Delivery* of the *Apostles Creed* <sup>h</sup>, every Article of which is expressly contained in the *Holy Scriptures*, so that this cannot be of any service to them, since both sides agree, that the *Creed* is but a *Summary* of the *Holy Scriptures*, which *Creed* he says was unanimously

without any variation believed, taught and delivered from hand to hand in every Church.

There is a passage in this third Chapter urged indeed by *F. Alexandre* <sup>k</sup>, but more prudently omitted by our Compiler, which, I think, may with abundance of reason be turned upon the *Romanists* by us in all points of Controversie betwixt us, as well as it was by *St. Irenaus* against the *Hereticks* of his time. He arguing against them that there were no *Bishops* in the World that either taught or knew of any such things as they held, urges them with this argument, That if the *Apostles* had known of any such hidden *Mysteries* <sup>l</sup> which they were to teach the *Per-*

<sup>l</sup> — Etenim si recondita Mystéria scissent Apostoli, qua seorsim &

fect only in private and unknown to the rest of their

<sup>h</sup> Hanc prædicationem cum accepit & hanc fidem—Ecclesia diligenter custodit—& consonanter hac prædicat & docet & tradit, quasi unum possidens or. D. Iren. adv. Her. l. 1. c. 3.

<sup>k</sup> Nat. Alex. p. 359.

their Disciples, they would most likely have delivered them to those to whom they committed those Churches they had planted; enforcing it with this reason, because they certainly would be very desirous that those to whom they left their Churches and their Episcopal Charge, should be very perfect and irreprovable in all things, which they could not be, if they wanted those secret Mysteries the Hereticks did pretend to.

And in the same manner may we urge against the Church of Rome, that if the Apostles had known of such things as Purgatory, Praying to Saints, and the Lawfulness of Worshipping Images, and the like, they would certainly either have put them down in their own Writings, or would have delivered them to those to whom they left their Charges, that so we might have seen and heard of these things among them as frequently and as unanimously as we do of the Tradition of the Apostles Creed.

But to return, and put a short Answer to these Quotations: the Tradition here spoken of was about the Apostles Creed; the Tradition here is what the Apostles had preached, and what the Apostles preached is the very same that they afterwards by the Will of God and the Request of Christians (as Eusebius<sup>m</sup>, for example, does<sup>m</sup> Hist. Eccl. inform us about three of the Gospels) committed to Writing. This is<sup>l. 3. c. 24.</sup> what Irenaeus himself says particularly in the first Chapter of this Book<sup>n</sup>, that we had no other knowledge of the Oeconomy of our Salvation than by the Labours of those by whom we first received the Gospel; which Gospel indeed at first They DELIVERED by PREACHING, but afterwards by the Will and Appointment of God committed It to WRITING, that IT might be the Foundation and Pillar of our Faith, [and so of our Salvation.]

If those Divine Writings be of that Efficacy as to found and stablish us in the True Faith, thither in God's name let us have recourse, and learn what the Apostles taught by what they writ. We have not the least ground or intimation from this Father of any Doctrines necessary to Salvation not written, or forgotten to be penned by the Apostles among the rest. We have his Opinion directly against any such secret Traditions. In a word, if it were God's Will, that the Apostles should commit to writing the same Word of Salvation that

latenter ab reliquis Perfectos docebant, His vel maxime traderem ea, quibus etiam ipsi Ecclesias committebant. Valde enim perfectos & irreprehensibiles in omnibus eos volebant esse, quos & Successores relinquebant, &c. St. Iren. c. Har. l. 3. c. 3.

<sup>n</sup> Non enim per alios dispositionem salutis nostrae cognovimus, quam per eos, per quos Evangelium pervenit ad nos, Quod quidem tunc praconiauerunt, postea vero per Dei voluntatem in SCRIPTURIS nobis TRADIDERUNT, Fundamentum & Columnam Fidei nostra futurum. St. Iren. adv. Her. l. 3. c. 1.

they had preached, I cannot see how it should come to pass, that some part of it should be written and another not. If it were all written, I am sure our Compiler is besides the Cushion, and the whole Church of Rome as much.

What I have said here is not only answer sufficient for what is out of *Irenæus*, but for the two next Testimonies from *Origen*°, the latter of which speaking so very honourably of the Scriptures, is a very unfit one for the Church of Rome's purpose, and would have been omitted, had either *F. Alexandre* or our Compiler read the whole Tract they so readily quote. The last from

which was, that they had nothing to do with the Scriptures; all the World knows the Reverence Tertullian had for the Falseness and

*Adoro Scripturæ plenitudinem, — Scriptum esse doceat Hermogenis Officina. Si non est scriptum, timeat Va illud adjicientibus aut detrahentibus destinatum. Tertull. advers. Hermogen. c. 22.*

Sufficiency of the Scriptures to all purposes, when  
 ' He said he adored the Fulness of the Scripture,  
 and bids Hermogenes to have a care of the Word  
 denounced against those that added or took any thing  
 away from Scripture, if he could not shew that  
 what he taught was to be found in the Scriptures.

And the same we can shew of St. Basil, who as he does plead Tradition without express Scripture for the Practices and Constitutions of the Church with the rest of the Fathers, as our Compiler

\* *Nubes Test.* p. 55, 56.  
*Nat. Alexan.* p. 375, 376, 377.

his Sermon about True Faith, declares it to be a manifest deviation from Faith, and a sign of Pride, either to reject any part of the Scriptures, or to add to them, since Christ had told us, that his Sheep would hear his voice, and not a Stranger's.

ΣΥΝΗ ΤΗ ΚΑΙ ΜΥΣΤΕΡΙΟΝ, Η ΕΠΙΣΤΑΣΙΣ ΤΩ ΜΗ ΜΥΣΤΕΡΙΟΝ, ΟΥ ΚΑΙΝ ΗΜΕΙΣ ΙΝΟΥ ΧΕΡΕΣ  
ΕΠΙΝΟ, ΤΑ ΜΑ ΟΥΚΑΤΑ ΤΙ ΜΕΙΣ ΕΟΜΕΣ ΑΝΕΙ. S. Basil. Sermo de vera Fide, T. 2. p. 251.

\* Nubes Test. Our Compiler is very exact in his next quotation, and \* gives us  
p. 57. book and page, but instead of thanking him, we must thank F. A-  
Nat. Alexap. lexandre, who help'd him to them, but should have remembered  
p. 377. himself to have quoted Oration instead of Book; the place from

*Gregory*





thers, but as to *points of Faith and Doctrines of necessity to Salvation* we do require with them the *Written Testimony of the Word of God*, or an *Universal uninterrupted Tradition as clear as that by which we receive the Scriptures themselves.*

---

## CH A P. IV.

### *Concerning Invocation of Saints.*

#### S E C T. I.

**H**OW little the Church of Rome is able to produce *Universal Tradition* for those points of *Controversie* which we at present contend about is what our Compiler's next head comes now to shew. That there is no foundation in *Scripture*, no command for, nor *Practice of Invocation of Saints*, or paying any *Religious Worship* to them or their *Reliques* is what they are forced to grant; they must then have recourse to *Tradition*, and shew us from that, what they were not able to doe from *Scripture* it self, that the Church of God always practised and taught such a *Worship of Saints and Reliques* as the Church of Rome doth now teach and practise.

Our Compiler begins this point with an account of the *Heresie of Vigilantius*, as *F. Alexandre* calls it; this account he hath borrowed out of that Fathers <sup>a</sup> account of the *Heresie of Vigilantius*; and every syllable of the *Testimonies* under this head for above twenty pages together out of the same Friend <sup>b</sup>: He tells us that in the beginning of the fourth Century *Vigilantius* began to teach his pestilent *Doctrines*: but this is a mistake of our Compiler, who hath placed *Vigilantius* here by the same figure that he puts *Damasus* and *Julianus* <sup>c</sup> in the Third Century, *Victor* in the first, and *Aerius* exactly in the middle of the same Century: *Vigilantius* lived in the beginning of the fifth Century, when the quarrel betwixt him and *St. Hierome* began; we are not at all concerned in this quarrel any farther than to stand by that *Doctrine* and those *Practices* which were most agreeable to the *Scriptures* the *Foundation of Faith*.

<sup>a</sup> In Par. 1.

Sec. 5. c. 3.

p. 50, 51. &c.

<sup>b</sup> *Dissertat. 5.*

in *Panoplia*

adv. *Hereses*

Scilicet, 5. in

Par. 2. Sec.

culi quinti.

<sup>c</sup> *Append. to*

*Nub. Test.*

p. 191.

The Differences betwixt us and the Church of Rome in these points are so well known, that I need spend no time about shewing wherein they are; it is sufficient to advertise that they of that Church teach and practise the putting up prayers to Saints and Angels, paying Religious Worship to them, prostrating themselves before Reliques and the like; every one of which we refuse upon reasons which from Scripture, and the purest Antiquity seem invincible to us.

The Church of Rome will have what she teaches and practises in these things to have been the Constant Practice and Original Tradition of the Whole Church of Christ: and this is the thing which lies upon them to prove, and this is what we demand, that they would shew us from the Writings of the Fathers, that the Invocation of Saints, and Worship of them and their Reliques was the Practice of the Universal Church in the first, second, third and fourth Ages of the Church: the Practice of the Three first Centuries is that which they know we so much value, and insist upon, and therefore always demand Evidences thence of any Doctrine or Practice, when Tradition was certainly freshest in their Memories, and the Fathers in best capacity of knowing the sense of Scriptures, and of the Apostles.

Our Compiler will not be the man serviceable to us in such demands: As to honouring the Saints in observing days in honour of them, he knows we doe it, and therefore needed not to bring passages from the latter end of the fourth Century and the fifth<sup>d</sup>, to prove it was then practised in the Church; he might very easily have shewn such a Practice from the first Ages of the Church.

But I will pass on to Invocation of Saints, and see whether He shews this to have been the Practice of the Three first Centuries and so on; and here Alas his Authorities fail him, and he is not able to produce us one: for his passages from St. Cyprian and Origen do onely prove what is generally piously believed that the glorified Saints do intercede for the Church Militant: and the two next from the fourth Century prove no more: But what is this to Invocation of Saints, is there no difference betwixt our praying to them, and their interceding for us?

The next Authority from Nazianzen cannot doe it, since all know this to be a Rhetorical Apostrophe; and his other Orations shew that this thing of addressing their discourse or wishes to the Saints was now but in its infancy, as is obvious (in his third Oration against Julian

<sup>a</sup> Nub. Test. p. 63, 64. &c. N. Alex. Diss. 5. in Pannoplia. in Par. 2. Sec. 5. p. 279, 281, 283, &c.

<sup>c</sup> Nub. Test. p. 67. N. Alex. p. 305. <sup>f</sup> Nub. Test. p. 58. N. Alex. p. 308.

<sup>g</sup> Nub. Test. p. 69. N. Alex. p. 309.

addressing himself to *Constantius*) does invincibly prove that it was far from being a settled belief then, that the *Saints* could hear or perceive requests put up to them: nor does any of his following *Authorities*<sup>b</sup> from *Gregory Nyssen*, *Chrysostome*, *Ambrose* prove any more than an interpellation or Request to the *Saints*, that they would do that which they did believe they were always doing, that is praying for the distressed here on earth: none of his Testimonies proceed so far as to prove any formal Prayers like those now used in the Church of *Rome*; they look much liker the Requests from *Equals*, or familiar Friends; let but any one compare the Speech of *Gregory Nyssen* for example<sup>i</sup> where he applies himself to *Theodorus* the Martyr, with the Devotions of the present Church of *Rome* to the *Saints*, and he will easily see the great difference betwixt the Prayers used now during Divine Service, and the Requests then made in their Orations.

<sup>b</sup> Nub. Test.  
p. 70, 71, &c.  
N. Alex.  
p. 311, 312,  
&c.

<sup>i</sup> Nub. Test.  
p. 70.

So that we of the Church of *England* are still where we were, notwithstanding our Compiler, we dare not practise Invocation of *Saints*, because we believe Prayer, or Religious Invocation to be peculiar to God alone, who will not give his Glory<sup>k</sup> to any other; who in any of our necessities hath directed us to call upon him<sup>l</sup> and hath promised that he will deliver us: we believe our blessed Saviour knew his Father's mind better than all the men in the World, who ordered his Disciples, and us by them, to put up our Prayers to Our Father (not to this or that Saint) that is in Heaven,

<sup>k</sup> Isa. 42. 8.

<sup>l</sup> Psal. 50. 15.

We do not follow the latter Ages of the Church in their Interpellations to *Saints*, because as we are sure that they had not Scripture to ground their Practice upon, so we are as certain that they had not the Example of the first Ages to guide them into such Practices. But we are farthest of all from joyning with the present Church of *Rome*, which hath turned the Interpellations and Requests used to *Saints* in the fifth and sixth Centuries into formal Prayers and Services, and hath put her Prayers to them into the most solemn parts of her Devotions, into her Litany for instance; so that if we could not admit of using such Requests to *Saints*, because groundless and without Example, we have far more reason to reject Invocation and solemn Prayers to *Saints* as Superstitious, since it is against Scripture, and against the Practice of the three first Centuries of the Church, against a Council in the fourth Century, and wants a Pattern even in the fifth and sixth, and hath no example in any of the places produced by our Compiler on this head.

This

This is sufficient to shew, that *what* our Compiler hath produced from the *End* of the *fourth*, and from the *fifth* Century does not defend or reach up to the present Practices of the Church of Rome in this point, since there is so great a difference betwixt Interpellations put up in Rhetorical Orations and Homilies, and Prayers used in the very Litanies themselves; betwixt Requests not put up in the Liturgies of the Church, nor commanded any where in Antiquity for those first five hundred years of the Church; and Prayers formally put into the Liturgies of the Church of Rome, and as strictly commanded to be used by all her members. In Origen's time we are sure that the Doctrine of the Church was that no worship nor adoration [nor consequently no Invocation] was to be paid to Angels <sup>in be-</sup> <sup>— ἀλλ' ἐκ</sup> cause all prayer, supplication, intercession and thanksgiving was to be <sup>ὡς περὶ τῶν</sup> offered up to God Almighty by the high Priest, (our Lord Jesus Christ) <sup>συνεχῶς ἡμῶν</sup> and it was lookt upon as an absurd thing to invoke Angels [or <sup>τῶν Διακε-</sup> Saints, for the same reason holds for both] who had no knowledge of Angels <sup>νῶν] αὐτῶν</sup> the particular affairs of men. <sup>— σέβειν ἐ</sup> <sup>σεσομένον</sup>

ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ. πῶς οὖν ἂν εἰς αὐτοὺς, καὶ προσευχὴν καὶ ἑντευξιν καὶ εὐχαριστίαν ἀναπαύσας τοῖς ἐν τῷ πᾶσι Θεοῖς, διὰ τοῦ ἐν πᾶσι Ἀγγέλων Ἀρχιερέως. — Ἀγγέλους καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀναπαύσας καὶ ὡς ἐν ἀνθρώποις καὶ αὐτοῖς ἐπιστάμεν ἢ ἐν τοῖς. Origen. contr. Celsum l. 5. p. 233. Edit. Cantabr.

As this was the Doctrine of the *third* Century, so as soon as Invocation of Angels began to take root in some parts of the Church in the fourth Age, the Council of Laodicea (which was confirmed by the General Council of Chalcedon) in her 35th Canon did command that no Christians should leave the Church of God, and go and Invoke Angels, and did anathematize any that <sup>in</sup> should be guilty of <sup>in</sup> this secret Idolatry, and did interpret it to be a forsaking of Christ: <sup>Εἴ τις ἐν</sup> <sup>εὐσεβίᾳ παύ-</sup>

κρυμμένη εἰδωλολατρεῖα βολᾶται, ἢ ἂν Ἀνάδημα, ὅτι ἐγγετίμην καὶ Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, ἢ τὸν Θεόν, καὶ εἰδωλολατρεῖα προσέλθῃ. Can. 35. Conc. Laodiceen. p. 53. in Bibliotheca Juris Canonici Veteris. Edit. Justel. 1661.

I cannot but observe upon this Canon, that Theodoret interpreting the *eighteenth* verse <sup>o</sup> of the *second* Chapter to the Colossians, which speaks about the Worshipping of Angels, makes this Canon to forbid the praying to Angels; and farther that they that were so fond of this Superstition were forced to leave the Churches

<sup>o</sup>—Quocirca Synodus quoque quæ convenit Laodiceæ, quæ est Phrygiæ Metropolis, lege prohibuit NE PRECARENTUR ANGELOS: & in bodiernum usque diem licet videre apud illos & eorum finitimos Oratoria Sancti Michaelis. Theodoret. in Ep. ad Coloss. c. 2. 18. p. 766. Edit. Lat. Paris. 1608.

where-



wherein it seems *Invocation of Angels* (much less of *Saints*) was not to be had, nor any such *Practices* in their *Liturgies*. I will conclude this Chapter and discourse with *St. Austin*, who speaking of the honour due to the *Martyrs*, says that they did not erect *Temples* to them as if they were *Gods*, but appointed *Commemorations* of them as *dead men*, whose *Spirits* are with the *Lord*; that they were named in

<sup>m</sup> *Nos autem* their place and order, but not *Invoked* by the *Priest*, who sacrificed <sup>m</sup>.

*Martyribus*

*nostris non Tempia sicut Diis, sed Memorias sicut hominibus mortuis, quorum apud Deum vivunt Spiritus, fabricamus—, suo loco & ordine NOMINANTUR, non tamen à Sacerdote qui sacrificat, INVOCANTUR.* Aug. D. de Civ. Dei. l. 22. c. 10.

## SECT. II.

The very same Arguments that I had against the *Invocation of Saints*, I must also use against the paying any *Worship* to their *Reliques*: if the *Saints* themselves were never admitted by *God* into any share of his *Worship*, we cannot think their bones or ashes were: if the first ages of the Church never robbed *God* of his Honour by dividing of it betwixt him and his *Servants*, we have much more reason to believe that they would not impart it to the mortal *Remains* of those *Servants*. This we are certain of, that in all the accounts we have of the *History* and *Writers* of the first ages of the Church, when she certainly was in her greatest purity, we find nothing of their solicitude about searching for the *Bodies* and enshrining the *Reliques* of *Saints*, not a syllable about any worshipping of them, or seeking to them for help, and deliverance from diseases, or troubles.

The *Apostles* and *Virgin-Church* of *Christ* had undoubtedly as great a value, and as large apprehensions of the vast merit of the first *Christian Martyr St. Stephen*, as any age since can have for any *Martyrs*, or ought to pretend to: and yet we find them onely decently interring their *Martyred Brother*, no care about getting *Reliques*, or mangling his *Body* to have fingers, teeth or toes to shew in order to be kissed and prostrated to; such foolish and *Superstitious Actions* were the issue of more degenerate and fancifull times.

When the blessed *Martyr Ignatius* had according to his intense desire finished his course with *Martyrdom*, and was delivered a *Prey* in the *Amphitheatre* to the cruel *Lions*, who devoured all of him, but some hardest bones, the *Brethren* then attending his *Martyrdom*

tyrdom took up those & most valued bones, carried them to his beloved City, and buried them there. And not long after, when his Fellow-bishop St. Polycarp had glorified his Redeemer in the same way, and the faithfull, notwithstanding the inveterate groundless malice of the Jews, had gathered up all the bones that the fire had left, they committed <sup>q</sup> those bones, which they valued more than costly Pearls or Gold, to burial, and celebrated with Joy and Praises the Birth day (as the Church then called the day of Martyrdom) of this Saint in Memory of him, and such as had in the same victorious fights finished their courses, and for an incitement and preparation to all that were to combat in such bloody encounters.

*capla reposita sicut thesaurus inappreciabilis. Martyrium S. Ignat. p. 6. Edit. Usser. 1647.*  
 Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Ἐπίσκοπος τῶν ἁγίων ῥημάτων φιλονεικίαι, θεῖς αὐτοῖν. (viz. Polycarpum) ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ πυρὶ ἐβόων· ἅπαντες ἡμεῖς ὅτι ἐσιν ἀνελκόμενοι τὰ πρῶτα τῶν λείψανων πολυτελέστε, καὶ δοκιμασιὰς ἡμεῶν χρυσὸν ὅσα αὐτῶ ἀπὸ θανάτου ὅπου καὶ ἀκόλουθοι ἵ. ἐνθα οἱ θυγατέρες ἡμῶν συναρμύλλοις ἐν σφαλλιδόσιν καὶ γὰρ παρέξει ὁ Κύριος σπῆλαι· καὶ τὸ μαρτυρεῖν αὐτῶν ἡμεῶν γε-  
 νήσεται, ὅτι τὸ καὶ ἡμεῶν ἀνακτόντων μνήμην, καὶ ἡμεῶν μακάριον ἀνακτόντων καὶ ἐπιμαρτυρίαν. Eccl. Smyrnenis Epistola de Martyrio Polycarpi, p. 28. Edit. Usser.

I cannot pass here the observing of that in this Golden Letter of the Church of Smyrna, which will give us the true sentiments and innocent practices of the then Christians: the Devil and the malicious Jews by his instigation persuaded the Prefect to deny the Christians leave to take and bury the body of this blessed Saint Polycarp (after the Executioner had done that office upon this Saint <sup>q</sup> which the fire would not left they should leave their Crucified Saviour, and fall to worshipping of him.

πατέρας—ἐντυχῆν τῷ ἀντικρίστῳ, ὅτι καὶ δύναιτο αὐτῷ τὸ σῶμα παρέν, μὴ, εἰπον, ἀγνοήσας ὅτι ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος, τῶτον ἀξίωνται σέβειν. Eccl. Smyrn. Epist. de Martyrio Polycarp. p. 27. Edit. Usser. 1647.

This cheat and malice of the Devil and his Instruments the Church of Smyrna take notice of in this Epistle, and shew that spite and ignorance together were the Causes of this Calumny: since Christians never could leave the worship and service of Christ who had suffered all for their sins, nor pay any worship or adoration to any other person (or as the Old Latin Translation hath it, nor offer up the supplication of prayer to any other person): The Son of God (say they) we worship <sup>q</sup> καὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, προσκυνοῦμεν, πῶς καὶ Ματθαῖος, ὡς μαθηταὶ καὶ μαρτυροῦντες τῷ Κυρίῳ Ἀγαποῦμεν ἀξίως, ἐν τῇ Εὐθείᾳ ἀνυπερβλήτως καὶ εἰς τὸ ἰδίον Βασιλεῖα καὶ Δουλεύματα. Ibidem.

and

and adore, but his Martyrs we justly love, as being not onely his Disciples, but Imitators of his Sufferings, we love them for that very great good-will which they have shewed to their King and Master.

I have often wondred how they of the Church of Rome who reade this Epistle either dare practise the Worshipping of Saints or Reliques, or can pretend to say that Antiquity did doe the same; I am sure this Apostolick Church of Smyrna was so far from it, that they make it the spite and malice of the Infernal Fiend, and the Devilish Jews to say they would, and I am as sure that it is little less to say they did worship Saints or Reliques.

But to return to the Grave of that glorious Martyr, we find his bones committed to the Earth; after which it was the Care and Practice of the Church to dispose thus of the Bodies of their Martyred Brethren, and so very carefull the Church was in the first Ages in this point, that the Clergy of the Church of Rome<sup>v</sup> in their letter to the Clergy at Carthage, among a great deal of good advice about Discipline, and other things, I speak of this, as a thing of greatest Concern, that the Bodies of their Martyrs should be carefully buried by those who had the charge of that business, and make it a dangerous fault in these persons to neglect their duty herein.

After this account of the Practice of the first Ages of the Church about their care of the dead Martyrs and Brethren, Let us now see whether our Compiler can shew us the Practice of the Church to be contrary to what we have here set down, and whether he can shew that the Primitive Church did use those Acts of Worship, those Prostrations and Kissings, those Processions and Resorts to them for Cures and Assistance in Distresses, (which are now the ordinary stated Practices in the Church of Rome) during the three first Centuries, which He knows we always insist upon, and demand as the surest Witnesses of the Doctrines and Practices of the Apostles and the Church from the beginning.

Our Compiler is not able to produce even one Instance of any Reliques of Saints treasured up in order to cure Maladies, or be prostrated unto: but that he may not appear quite destitute of a Testimony from those purest Ages of the Church, he brings us in the old Chair of St. James Bishop of Jerusalem; but how comes this to be the Relique of that Saint, were St. James and his Chair\* so near a-kin as to be both of a piece? the world is very low with such people,

<sup>v</sup> Et quod maximum est, corpora Martyrum aut caterorum si non sepeliantur, grande periculum imminet eis, quibus incumbit hoc opus. Cleri Rom. ad Cler. Carth. Ep. 8. inter Cypriani Ep. p. 18. Edit. Oxon.

\* Nub. Test.  
p. 75. N. Alex.  
p. 231.

people, when they are forc'd to bring in old Chairs instead of the Saints Bodies, or any parts of them; but let it pass for a sort of a Relique, does it appear from Eusebius (out of whom the quotation is brought) that the Christians then worshipped it, carried it about in solemn Processions, or that it was resorted to for Cures, or that it did any great Cures? This our Compiler should have shewn, and without it, I must tell him that this is worse than trifling, because we are now about the Defence of the present Practices of the Church of Rome, by shewing that the Primitive Church practised the same.

But F. Alexandre told him, and he doth tell us, that the Faithfull of the Church of Jerusalem did shew great Reverence to this Chair: 'tis true, Valesius his Translation (which Father Alexandre follows here, though Christopherson is his man at other times) says this; but the Mischief is, Eusebius himself does not; what Eusebius says is, that the faithfull at Jerusalem were wont, and to that day did shew to all Comers the <sup>x</sup> Chair it self which St. James sate Bishop in: which, I think, is pretty different from Valesius his translation about shewing great reverence to the Chair it self; as to the Honour they then payed to the Memories of the Saints themselves, it was but what was highly just, and that wherein they are imitated by us, as well as any other Christians.

His next Testimony from St. Cyril of Jerusalem is so far from being for them, that, I think, it may and ought to rise up as a Witness against them; for when God had given such a virtue to the bones of Elisha, as to raise a dead man, and when that Miracle was wrought by God's permission, can our Compiler shew, or dare any of his Church pretend to do it, that the Jewish Church did thereupon take up and enshrine the Prophets bones, that they appointed Processions to them, or did command the Worship of prostration or kissing to be paid to them, or that they used to frequent his Monument for the same or like Miracles?

This they ought to reflect upon, and to consider how far the Scriptures are from mentioning, or the Jewish Church from practising any religious and superstitious addresses to those bones, notwithstanding so extraordinary a Miracle effected by them. How happy had it been for the Christian Church if Christians had kept within the same bounds, and not given such a helping hand to the Superstitions and Idolatries of after ages by their hunting out and fear-

<sup>x</sup> Τὸν Ἰακώβου θρόνον — εἰς  
Ἰουδαίαν περιελαγμένον οἱ πάντες καὶ  
ἐκείνῳ προσκύνοντες ἀλλὰ οὐκ ἐν  
αὐτῷ τῆς πίστεως ἐμπόδιον. Euseb.  
Hist. Eccl. l. 7. c. 19.

7 Nub. Test.  
p. 75.  
Nat. Alex.  
p. 232.

ching so much for the *Ashes* and *Remains* of the *Servants* of *God*, some of whom had been buried above a thousand years before?

This therefore we must grant to the *Members* of the *Church* of *Rome*, that *Superstition* taking root in the end of the fourth Century of the *Church*, a great part of *Religion* began to be placed in searching for *Martyrs bones*, in building *Churches* where they found or fixed them, especially when they found that *God* was pleased at those places (I dare not say by those *Ashes* and *Bones*) to work *Miracles*, upon which they did pay an Honour to those *Reliques*; but that they did worship them as they now do in the *Church* of *Rome*, is what themselves so often deny; *St. Hierome*<sup>2</sup> in particular, who contended so earnestly for them with *Vigilantius*.

<sup>2</sup> Nos autem non dico Martyrum Reliquias, sed nō Solem quidem—non Angelos, non Archangelos—colimus & adoramus. D. Hieron. adv. Vigilant. ad Riparium.

Had the *Church* of *Rome* stayed here, and not proceeded so much farther in these things, I do not see that we could have broken *Communion* with them upon such an account; and therefore I need not examine by retail his *Testimonies* from the latter end of the fourth and fifth Centuries, the design of which he himself makes onely to prove that the *Fathers* kept the *Reliques* of *Saints* with *Respect* and *Veneration*, and believed that *God* often wrought *Miracles* by them: which we do grant the *Fathers* of those latter ages did, and might doe it too, as long as they kept (as they said of themselves that they always did) from paying *Religious Worship* unto them: but we say withall, that what the *Christians* of those Ages did about these things does no ways defend the present *Extravagancies* of the *Church* of *Rome*; the excesses wherein about *Reliques* are come to that *Standalous* height, as to make the learned men of their own *Church* ashamed of them.

As to the *Practice* of the *Church* of *England*, which inquires not after, nor is solicitous about the *Reliques* of *Saints*, this may be said in her Defence, that she finds no *Practice* of *Church* and about any such searching after the bones of the Dead in any part of *Scripture* of either *Testament*, but that their whole care then was to commit them to their *Sepulchres* in hopes of a future *Resurrection*, and never to disturb their *Ashes*; and therefore she thinks it must needs be her greatest commendation, that she is more careful to imitate what the *Scriptures* written and practised in the *Scriptures* themselves, than to imitate what the fourth Age of the *Church* began to practise, when



when the Church of Christ was near four hundred years old: The Holy Scriptures themselves are the Rule of her Faith, and for any Apostolical Practices she inquires among them, who lived with the Apostles or nearest to them; among whom finding nothing of any searching for Reliques, or any Miracles done by them in those first three hundred years, she is resolved to practise what the Christians of those first and purest Ages did, rather than what after-ages did, wherein plenty and prosperity let loose the reins to some peoples fancies, and made that a part of Religion which was never any before.

## C H A P. V.

### Concerning Prayers for the Dead.

#### S E C T. I.

**T**HE next point under debate that our Compiler presents us with is that about Prayers for the Dead. Aetius (he says) condemned Praying for the Dead, and that the Fathers practised it, and owned it as advantageous to the Souls departed: Every word of which we freely grant, how then is this a Controversie betwixt us at present under debate? They of his Church have been so often told of, and shewn the vast difference betwixt the Prayers used in the Primitive Church, and those by the present Romish Church, that I cannot but wonder that they are not ashamed of still urging the Prayers of the Ancients, and making them the grounds of their Belief of a Purgatory.

We always grant that Antiquity practised Praying for the Dead, so that our Compiler's Testimonies borrowed from F. Alexandre's fourth first Dissertation<sup>a</sup> are mustered up to no purpose, since they are brought in here to prove that which no one denies. That which is a real Controversie betwixt us (if our Compiler durst have spoken out as his Master F. Alexandre doth, who urges all the Testimonies<sup>b</sup> our Compiler sets down for the Proof of Purgatory it self) is, whether there is such a place as Purgatory, and

<sup>a</sup> Nat. Alex. Dissertatio quadragesima prima in Par. secunda Sec. 4. p. 392, &c.

<sup>b</sup> Purgatorium esse, in quo expiatur anima iustorum—: &c Pre-

ces Ecclesia ipsis illo in statu profes-  
se, Traditione — demonstratur.  
And then he sets down the Au-  
thorities which our Compiler bor-  
rows, p. 392.

whether consequently we ought to use Prayers for the Souls in it, or can help them out thence by the saying of Masses here: and this is that which we demand of them to prove, that either the Scriptures taught, or the Primitive Church believed that there is a third state or place called Purgatory, wherein the souls of those who died in the favour of God were. (in order to the satisfying the Justice of God for the temporal punishments due to those sins, the eternal Punishment whereof God had already remitted before death) to endure fiery torments equal to those in Hell, till they had fully satisfied God's Justice, or their Friends had obtained a release of part of those torments for them, and got them released thence into the place and state of justified Souls; and we demand farther of them to shew, that the Word of God (supposing that it did teach, and Antiquity believe a Purgatory) did enjoin or commend the Prayers of the Living for the Souls of their deceased Friends in Purgatory, or that it did anywhere declare that such Prayers would be advantageous to the Souls in Purgatory, and could release them thence; and we demand of them lastly to shew, that Antiquity for the first three hundred, nay five hundred years, did ever use Prayers for the Release of the Souls of their deceased Friends out of this Purgatory.

This is the true state of the Controversie betwixt us; we deny that the Word of God doth teach any such thing as a Romish Purgatory, or that Antiquity believed any such place, we deny that either the Scriptures did enjoin or commend, or that Antiquity did use Prayers to deliver the Souls of their deceased Friends out of the flames of Purgatory: as for the mistaken passage in the Maccabees, which is also against their Tenets, they know we do not own it for Scripture.

They of the Compiler's Church do affirm the contrary, and therefore why did not he go regularly to work to disprove us? why did not he bring us the passages of the Primitive Fathers which shew they believed Purgatory, and the Prayers which were used then for the release of those miserable souls out of the fiery torments of Purgatory, if there were such a belief of Purgatory and such Prayers used, as are now in the Church of Rome, during the first three or five hundred years? But this is that which they are never able to doe; and therefore, instead of keeping close to the point under debate, and proving either a Purgatory or Prayers used by the Primitive Church for release of Souls in Purgatory, they slip the

Debate,

*Debate*, let fall the *Question*, and fall a proving of *that* which no body denies, that the *Fathers* in the *first ages* used *Oblations* and *Prayers* for the *Dead*; never considering in the mean time that *those Prayers* and *Oblations* were used by the *Ancients* for the *very best of men*, for their *Martyrs* and *Saints*, for the *Virgin Mary* herself, that they were put up for *those* whom they believed to be in a *state of Light*, and *Joy*, and *Comfort*; than which *what* can be farther either from the *Doctrine* or the *Practice* of the *present Church of Rome*? We do confess withall that *these Prayers* were offered up also for *pardon of sins*; but neither will this reach the case of the *Church of Rome*, since *these prayers* for *pardon of sins* were generally for *those* who were in a *state of Rest* and *Comfort*, and there is not a word in them for *deliverance* from *pains* and *torments* undergon in *Purgatory*.

## S E C T. II.

Thus in the *Testimonies* themselves which *F. Alexandre*, and after him his *implicit servant* the *Compiler*, have heaped up under this head; the first of them <sup>c</sup> from (the pretended) *Dionysius*, <sup>a</sup> *Nub. Test.* makes the *Bishop* offer *Prayers* over the *dead* for *pardon of sins* of hu- <sup>p. 85.</sup> mane infirmity, and that he may be placed in the *Region of Light*: but *Nat. Alex.* if our *Compiler* had read the whole *Chapter* he from *F. Alexandre* <sup>Dissert. 41.</sup> quotes, he might have seen the *Services* and this *Prayer* was put <sup>in Par. 2.</sup> for one, who was a *Holy Servant of God*, who was by death at an <sup>Sec. 4. p. 392.</sup> end of all *Combats*, and was already in *joy* and *settled hopes* <sup>a</sup> waiting for a *blessed Resurrection*: not a word of which is consistent <sup>Αὐτὸς μὲν</sup> with being in the *flames* and *torments* of the *fire of Purgatory*; or could be said of one who was now a *purging* in them. <sup>ἵσθαι τὸ</sup> <sup>πῶς ἐργά-</sup> <sup>σθαι τὸ</sup> <sup>κρίων ἀγώ-</sup> <sup>γων, εὐφρο-</sup>

σώματι ἵσθαι ἀπαλλαγῆναι, καὶ σὺν ἑσθλῇ πολλῇ σελῇ ἵδεν ὀφθαλμοῖς τὴν ἱερὰν παλιγγεννησίαν. οἱ δὲ τὸ κοινοῦ δέονται εὐχόμενοι—αὐτὸν τὸ, ὅς τῃ δυνάμει μακαρίστως σελῇ τὸ νικηθέντων εὐχέλαιος ἀνικητόρων γίγῃ. *Dionys. de Eccles. Hierarch. c. 7. p. 407. Edit. Antwerp. 1634.*

And so the next from *Tertullian* appears not to be different, especially since all are agreed that *Martyrs* themselves were herein <sup>a</sup> commemorated; and for the *Refreshment* prayed for in the second <sup>p. 85.</sup> quotation, it did relate to that *state of Sequester*, wherein *Tertullian* <sup>Nat. Alex.</sup> thought the *Souls* of the most *holy* were detained till the day of *Judg-* <sup>p. 394.</sup> <sup>a</sup> *Nub. Test.* <sup>p. 85.</sup> <sup>Nat. Alex.</sup> <sup>p. 394.</sup> <sup>395.</sup> <sup>monies</sup> ment, and not at all to any *Purgatory*. The next from *St. Cyprian* relates only to the same that *Dionysius*'s did. The following *Testi-*



we entered upon a life free from Passions and from trouble, where no danger of wounds or stripes, no fear of dreadful fire, nor of any of the Calamities from Earthquakes, Shipwrecks and such afflictions which they are altogether free from: And he runs on with shewing their State to be infinitely more happy than ours, which he could never have done, had he believed a Roman Purgatory; and though He thought them free from most of the Afflictions which torment and disquiet us here, yet he must have excepted the danger and dread of fire, since if he was of the Romish Opinion, he must believe that some of the Dead had not onely reason to fear Fire, but did really feel it in order to their expiating the temporal Punishment of their sins.

The next Authority from St. Basil<sup>1</sup> about a purging Fire, devouring the sin confessed, cannot relate to Purgatory, since the Father doth not refer this devouring of sin after Confession to a state after this life, but speaks of it as an effect consequent to Confession of sins, which Confession is not thought to be an employment in the grave, or possible after our departure: hence : and which is more, the Father himself means by this purging Fire, the Holy Spirit of God, which when Confession (as the Father allegorizes) hath made sin as it were dry & straw, doth devour it, as Fire doth dry stubble, and he explains himself so in this same Comment<sup>m</sup> when he makes the purging fire to be that same fire wherewith Cleophas and his brother-disciple's hearts were inflamed, while they talked in the way with our Saviour.

1618. *ἡ δὲ ἐκπύρις ἡ ἀγαθὴ καὶ ἡ κακὴ πῦρ, τοῦτο πῦρ καλεῖται καὶ*  
*Σίμων ὁ ὁσάκις ἡ κακὴ πῦρ. S. Basil. Comm. in e. 6. Epist. p. 988. T. 1. Edit. Paris*

— Ἐπεὶ  
τοῦτο τὸ ἔργον  
τοῦτο διὰ τὴν  
ἐκείνου, τοῦ  
ἐκείνου κα-  
τασκευασ-  
τοῦτο

St. Gregory Nazianzen's *Tefimony*,<sup>n</sup> had better been omitted, <sup>n</sup> *Nub. Test.*  
since there is too much reason to believe that it falls in with that <sup>p. 87.</sup>  
from Gregory Nysson about the final Salvation of all men after a severe <sup>Nat. Alexan.</sup>  
Fire, because he applies that *last Baptism by Fire* to the Novatian <sup>p. 397.</sup>  
Heresicks, who are not thought by our Compiler's friends to call  
at Purgatory, and were believed by the Primitive Christians to  
have cut themselves off (by their Schism and Heresie persisted in)  
from ever coming into the Kingdom of Heaven: however to doe  
Gregory Nazianzen all the right we can, we must say that he ought  
not to be charged with that destructive Origenian Error, since he  
speaks so doubtingly of it, *νεν, a perhaps, does not use to speak*

*n Nub. Test.*  
*p. 87.*  
*Nat. Alexan.*  
*p. 397.*



man's belief, but a *guess* or *doubt*: and therefore, I think; our Compiler is at his old game, when he so *ensnaringly* and *slily* translates this passage, in the next life they may come to be baptized by Fire, which is far from discovering to an *unwary* English Reader any doubt of St. Gregory's of the thing; whereas He himself says only, that there *PERHAPS* they will be baptized with fire, the last, most painfull and enduring Baptism, which doth [or will] devour the gross matter as hay, and consume the lightest and most frail sins.

• Nub. Test.  
p. 88.  
Nat. Alexan.  
p. 398.

Ensebius is next produced • to tell us of the Prayers put up for the Soul of the Emperour Constantine the Great, but can our Compiler or any friend of his shew either that Ensebius said, or did believe that Constantine was then in Purgatory, or that those Prayers were put up to deliver him from thence? He was so far from believing that Emperour's soul in such a miserable tormented condition, that in this very Chapter he speaks of the tabernacle of his most happy Soul: and the people were so far from putting up prayers for that purpose, or believing his Soul to be in such a miserable state, that they had Medals in honour of his Memory<sup>9</sup>, on the one side of which was a representation of a hand from heaven lifting him up thither, whereby they certainly believed that his blessed Soul was in Heaven. Epiphanius his Testimony is to no purpose, since it onely shews in general that prayers were used for the dead, does not prove in particular that these prayers were to rescue Souls out of the flames of Purgatory.

P Euseb. de  
Vita Const.  
l. 4. c. 71.

9 Euseb. de  
Vita Const.  
l. 4. c. 73.

Nub. Testium,  
p. 88.  
Nat. Alexan.  
p. 398.

### S E C T. III

† Nubes Test.  
p. 88, 89.  
Nat. Alexan.  
p. 398, 399.

We have next three or four large passages from St. Chrysostome, the first testimony from whom<sup>†</sup> doth prove not onely that they prayed for the Just, but for the Wicked also: however there is nothing here to determine that they then believed a Purgatory, or that the help they intended their deceased friends by their prayers was a deliverance from the torments of it; there is that in this same Homily which is evidence enough against it, where St. Chrysostome, speaking of the Husbandman's rejoicing when his corn is dissolved in the earth, because he is assured it will then grow up, compares the burial of the righteous to such a sowing in the earth, and would have Christians rejoice when the faithful pass off their earthly houses, and are thus, as it were, sown in the earth, to grow up into Immortality<sup>†</sup>: after which (if I apprehend him right, as I am pretty certain I do) he compares our being

† S. Chryf.  
Hom. 41. in  
1. Epist. ad  
Corinth. in  
T. 5. in N. T.  
p. 466. Edit.  
Duczi.

being sown (to keep to his Metaphor) in the grave to the other sowing, by which we are brought into the world, and shews the mighty advantage of the first above the other; that to our being sown<sup>r</sup> or born into the world succeed death and labours, perils and cares, whereas, if we have lived well, Crowns and Rewards do immediately succeed our being sown in the grave; that corruption and death are the consequents of our being born into the world, whereas Incorruption and Immortality, and ten thousand other happinesses (among which I hope no body will reckon Purgatory) are the attendants of the death of the righteous.

The second Testimony doth endeavour to shew that the faithfull do receive benefit by the Prayers put up for them<sup>r</sup>; but how does our Compiler, or any of his Party shew that this benefit was the deliverance of those faithfull from the flames of Purgatory? Had either our Compiler, or his Guide himself but given themselves the trouble to peruse this Homily, which they both quote, they could not have avoided the reading that, which utterly ruins any such groundless thing; there they would have found this holy Father dissuading the Christians from a bewailing the Dead in General, and how he reasons against it: he allows them to bewail the wicked not onely when dead, but while alive, because they live in a continual Rebellion against God, and are shut out from his Kingdom; but for the just, he would have Christians to rejoyce not onely while alive, but when they are dead<sup>\*</sup> because they are blessed as soon as translated hence, because they are gone TO CHRIST, and are always with their heavenly King, but much more after their decease, when they no longer by Faith or at a distance see him, but enjoy him face to face, &c.

ἀπλῶς, ἀλλὰ πῖ; πενθῶμεν καὶ ἀμαρτωλὸς καὶ ἀσθενήσωντας μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ζῶντας· χαίρομεν δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς θείοις, καὶ ζῶντες μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πενθῶμεν· ἔκρινον μὲν καὶ ζῶντας πενθῶμεν, ὅτι καὶ ἀποθανόντες ζῶντες, οὐκ οἶμαι καὶ ἐπαύδα ὅστις ἐλευθερὸς πάντων ἦσιν, ἐπειδὴ θεῷ προσκρινόμενος, ὅτι καὶ ἐκτὶ ματαστάντες, μαχέσθαι, ὅτι πρὸς τὸ Χριστὸν ἀπῆλθον· οἱ ἀμαρτωλοὶ, ὅτι οὐ ζῶσι, πρὶν τῷ βασιλεὺς εἶσι, διὰ τὸ τοιοῦτον ἄξιον· οἱ δὲ θείοις, ἄντε ἐπαύδα, ἄντε ἐκείν, καὶ τῷ βασιλεὺς εἶσι, &c. D. Chrys. Hom. 3. in Ep. ad Philip. in T. 5. in Nov. Test. p. 31. Edit. Ducei.

I appeal to any man of sense, whether there is a word that tends towards the teaching a Purgatory here, I appeal to all men, to our Compiler himself, whether any man could express his Mind more directly against a Purgatory than this Father in this place, when he

I

tells

\* — Ἐκείν [viz. ἀπεθῆν] μὲν δὲ διαλυσθῆναι θανάτου καὶ πένου, καὶ κινδύνοι καὶ θανάτου, ταῦτα δὲ, ἀνὸς δὲ βίωσιν, σίανον καὶ βραβεῖαν· καὶ τὸ μὲν φθαρτὸν καὶ θάνατον, καὶ τὸ ἀφθαρτὸν καὶ ἀθάνατον καὶ τὰ μυστήρια αἰωνία. Idem Ibidem.

\* Nub. Test. p. 90. N. Alex. p. 399.

\* Μὴ τοῖς ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀποθνήσκουσιν πενθῶμεν ἀπλῶς, μὲν δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς ζῶσι χαίρομεν.

tells us that the righteous, when they die, are happy, go to Christ, and are ever with their heavenly King, whom they enjoy by faith indeed here, but as soon as they are translated hence, see him face to face.

\* Nubes Test.  
p. 91, 92.  
Nat. Alex.  
p. 399, 400.

The next large passage from the same Father \* does but prove the same, out of which our Compiler hath cunningly left out what relates to the oblations being offered for the Martyrs themselves: and here again I must tell our Compiler, that his Guide either never read this Homily he quotes, or acts very disingenuously in bringing St. Chrysostome's words to prove a Purgatory; against which he is as exprels as words can make him, when he shews that to lament the death of the righteous is as ridiculous as if we should bemoan y one invited to a Kingdom, and tells them, how the Angels at the death of the faithfull are sent from Heaven to call their fellow-servant, and to bring him to Christ's heavenly Kingdom, and he concludes that the faithfull is not to be lamented, since his Soul, leaving this earthly tabernacle, batts straight unto the Lord.

Ἐπεὶ δὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι καὶ οἱ ἁγιοὶ ἔρχονται εὐαγγελίζεσθαι τὸν βασιλέα τῶν οὐρανῶν οὐκ ἐστιν ἡ λύπη τοῦ βασιλέως ἀλλὰ τὸ χαρῶν εἶναι καὶ τὸ εὐαγγελίζεσθαι τὸν λαόν. ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς οὐκ ἐπὶ τῇ σαρτί τῇ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἀποκαθίσταται ἀλλὰ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ. ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς οὐκ ἐπὶ τῇ σαρτί τῇ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἀποκαθίσταται ἀλλὰ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ. ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς οὐκ ἐπὶ τῇ σαρτί τῇ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἀποκαθίσταται ἀλλὰ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ.

Ἐπεὶ δὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι καὶ οἱ ἁγιοὶ ἔρχονται εὐαγγελίζεσθαι τὸν βασιλέα τῶν οὐρανῶν οὐκ ἐστιν ἡ λύπη τοῦ βασιλέως ἀλλὰ τὸ χαρῶν εἶναι καὶ τὸ εὐαγγελίζεσθαι τὸν λαόν. ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς οὐκ ἐπὶ τῇ σαρτί τῇ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἀποκαθίσταται ἀλλὰ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ. ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς οὐκ ἐπὶ τῇ σαρτί τῇ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἀποκαθίσταται ἀλλὰ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ. ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς οὐκ ἐπὶ τῇ σαρτί τῇ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἀποκαθίσταται ἀλλὰ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ.

\* D. Chryf.  
Homil. 3. in  
Ep. ad Philip.  
p. 32.

I will observe here that as some of the Fathers, St. Chrysostome among the rest, did believe that their prayers were available to the righteous by gaining for them some accession of glory<sup>2</sup>, so they were of opinion that they would procure some alleviation of torments, some small assistance for the wicked, and therefore did practise and advise the offering up of them for those eternally miserable Souls: He that will peruse St. Chrysostome's third Homily upon the Epistle to the Philippians, will see this very evident, and may also see there, notwithstanding this, how far that Father was from believing such a state or place as Purgatory.

\* Nub. Test.  
p. 92. N. Alex.  
p. 400, 401.

I need not insist on his last Testimony from this \* Father, which does not reach so far as the other three towards our Compiler's purpose, since it onely advises the oblation of Alms for the increase of happiness to his Sons Soul, but I would not omit giving our Compiler a little farther advice here, that he would look over this Homily, and then he will leave this passage out of his next book for Purgatory, as well as he has left the Vision of Perpetua out of this: in this Homily he may see how St. Chrysostome urges his old reason for their not bewai-

*bewailing the death of the righteous, because as soon as they are departed, they have clean escaped all dangers, and do with safety possess an everlasting happiness.*

In one word, whosoever will look into St. Chrysostome himself may very evidently see how he divides the dead into two conditions onely; the righteous which die in the favour of God, go, according to him, immediately unto their Lord, are immediately possessed of Crowns and eternal Rest, and a compleat security from any thing of pain, danger or trouble: the wicked and such as die in sin he places among the damned, for whom, though he did hope and believe that, by the Alms and Prayers of their Friends, they might have some small relief, some little abatement of torments, yet he doth teach that their Judgment is irreversibile upon this invincible reason † because there is no hope for them who depart loaded with the guilt of sins, that they can get rid of the guilt of those sins, after they are gone off the stage of this world: while they were on earth, God might wait, and expect that they would repent and become better; but when they are once gone off hence eis ἄδην unto the place of the damned, OR state of the dead, there is no hopes of gaining by repentance any release, since in this place or state there is no confession of sins to God, for which St. Chrysostome quotes the sixth verse of the sixth Psalm according to the Seventy. It were easie to bring a hundred places out of that Father, that speak the same thing, but I have already gathered more than enough to shew that St. Chrysostom's Doctrine is utterly inconsistent with the Romish Purgatory.

† Ποία γὰρ ἐλπίς, εἰπέ μοι, καὶ ἡμαρτημάτων ἀπελθεῖν, ἐνθα ἐκ τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων σποδισαὶ. ἵως μὲν γὰρ ἦσαν ἐν ταῦτα, ὡς πρὶν ἀποθανοῦν, πολλὰ ἦν μετασθέντων, ὅτι βελτίους ἔσονται. ἀντὶ ἀπέλθουσιν εἰς ἄδην, ἐνθα ἔκ τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων καρτάναι τι (ἐν γὰρ τῷ ἁδῇ, οὐκ ἔστι, τίς ἐξομολογήσεται σοὶ πᾶς ἡμῶν ἁμαρτία). D. Chryl. Homil. 3. in Ep. ad Philipp. p. 31. Edit. Fr. Duc.

#### SECT. IV.

I will now pass on to the rest of our Compiler's Testimonies, the first of which from Theodoret <sup>a</sup> brings us no news, nor proves any thing for him: nor the next to it from St. Ambrose <sup>b</sup> though it makes a great shew: it is granted that St. Ambrose in this (anniversary) funeral Oration spoken so long after Theodosius his death, doth fall to praying for Rest for Theodosius, that his Soul may ascend to Heaven whence it came, and there be out of the power of death; and is so passionately earnest upon it, that he would not leave him, till by his Tears and Prayers he had brought him unto the Mountain of the

Nub. Test.  
p. 92.  
N. Alex.  
p. 401.  
Nub. Test.  
p. 92, 93.  
N. Alex.  
p. 402.

Lord, where He might enjoy Life for evermore. But does all this prove that St. Ambrose did believe that the Emperour's Soul was in Purgatory, or that Theodosius was in a miserable condition, for whom he seems to be so earnest with his Prayers and Tears? He that will affirm this must be as much a stranger to St. Ambrose as our brisk Compiler is: I will confine my self to this very Oration, which had Natalis Alexandre himself ever read, he would not have brought this passage in for a Proof of Purgatory, since it does so often appear (in every page but one I dare avouch it) that St. Ambrose did look upon Theodosius as already in glory, and enjoying perfect happiness.

Thus within ten lines of the beginning of this Oration he says<sup>e</sup> that Theodosius was now gone into his heavenly Kingdom, being admitted for his Piety unto those Mansions in heaven, which Christ said he would go to his Father to prepare, into the heavenly Hierusalem where he is now placed, &c. and a little farther he brings in the Soul of this great Emperour replenished<sup>d</sup> with the Holy Ghost, mounting up into Heaven, and telling the Angels and Archangels (who were according to St. Ambrose ignorant of things below, and therefore did inquire of him) that the love of God had been his employment here on earth: and after this falling upon the mention of the Rest of Sabbath for the People of God, St. Ambrose<sup>e</sup> tells his Auditours, that Theodosius being now wholly rid of worldly cares does rejoyce that He is taken from them, and employs his Soul onely upon the thoughts of the eternal Rest for blessed Souls: and again he<sup>f</sup> tells them, that Theodosius being freed from uncertain fight, did THEN ENJOY perpetual Light, and a never-ceasing Tranquillity, and that he did enjoy and rejoyce in the Communion and Company of the Saints in Glory.

1538.

<sup>d</sup> Ergo decedens à terris Pia Anima, & Sancto repleta Spiritu, quasi interrogantibus iis, qui sibi occurrerent cum sese ad sublimia & superna subrigeret, dicebat, Dilexi: —interrogabant Angeli vel Archangeli quid egisti in terris? (Occultorum enim SOLUS Cognitor Deus) dicebat, Dilexi. Idem Ibidem. p. 56.

<sup>e</sup> Feriatus his seculi curis Theodosius se ereptum gaudet, & elevat animam suam, atque ad illam perpetuam dirigit Requiem. Idem Ibidem. p. 58.

<sup>f</sup> Absolutus igitur dubio certamine fruitur NUNC Augusta Memoria Theodosius Luce Perpetuâ, Tranquillitate Diuturnâ, & pro iis, quæ in Corpore gessit, munerationis divinæ Fructibus gratulatur: Ergo quia dilexit—Dominum Deum suum, meruit Sanctorum Consortia. Idem Ibidem. p. 58.

I could add more, were not this more than enough to let the world see the intolerable disingenuity of our Compiler, and his Guide F. Alexandre, who will needs have St. Ambrose to be here praying Theodo-



Theodosius his Soul out of Purgatory, whereas it is as plain as any thing can be expressed, that St. Ambrose did believe that from the very moment of his death that Great Emperour was with God in Bliss and perfect Tranquillity.

The next Testimony from this Father <sup>g</sup> is to as little purpose, and <sup>g</sup> Nub. Test. had F. Alexandre himself (for as to our Compiler, he honest Soul <sup>p. 93. N. Alex.</sup> with an humble piece of implicitness sets down just what his Master <sup>p. 402.</sup> had) but set down also the line which is immediately before, and connected to, this Testimony, he might have saved me the trouble of answering here; St. Ambrose having told Faustinus that we ought not to be so much concerned for the Accidents of this World, put down for an example the Casualties of several famous Cities near them then in dust, and never like to return to their ancient splendour; and then begins to compare these with the loss of his Sister, who as the Father urges <sup>h</sup>, is but taken from us for a while, and doth there enjoy a much happier life, so that (here our Compiler's Testimony comes in) he ought not so much to bewail her as to follow her with his Prayers. If she did enjoy a much happier life, I am sure she was not then in the flames of Purgatory.

In the next Testimony <sup>i</sup> St. Hierome commends Pammachius for <sup>i</sup> Nub. Test. his great Charity, and for his designs of building a publick Hospital, <sup>p. 93. N. Alex.</sup> and thereby cherishing as it were with odours the Soul of Paulina his departed Wife; St. Hierome however was far from thinking her Soul in Purgatory flames, when just before he ends the Epistle, he speaks of her <sup>k</sup> as then enjoying a sweet sleep, or blessed Rest.

<sup>l</sup> — illa cum sorore Paulina  
DULCI SOMNO fruunt. D. Hieron. Ep. 26. ad Pammach. T. 1. fol. 76. Edit. Erasim. 1524.

What St. Austin <sup>1</sup> did in relation to his Mother Monica is far <sup>1</sup> Nubes Test. from proving that he did believe her in any Purgatory; in the <sup>p. 94, 95.</sup> very heat of his praying to God for her, that He would not enter into <sup>N. Alex.</sup> judgment with her, he owns <sup>m</sup> his belief that God had ALREADY DONE for Her ALL that He did pray for; and excuses this his Practice with a Request that God would approve of the Free-will Offerings of his Lips. I cannot but admire the foolishness of applying the next quotation (out of the twelfth Chapter of the

<sup>n</sup> Ne intres cum ea in Judicium. Superexultet Misericordia Judicium—. Et Credo FAM FERIS QUOD te rogo, sed Voluntaria oris mei approba Domine. D. Aug. Confess. l. 9. c. 13.

ninth Book of Confessions) to prove a Purgatory; surely when St. Austin desired all, that should hereafter read what he then wrote, would remember his Mother at God's Altar, it was not to pray her out of Purgatory; if it was, I am sure she hath had a sad time of it to lie there so long; notwithstanding which, I do not believe that, when F. Alexandre read this passage, or our Compiler after him, they were so civil as to put St. Austin's Mother into their Prayers among them, whose deliverance out of Purgatory they daily pray for in their Church.

▪ Nub. Test.

p. 95, 96.

N. Alex.

p. 403, 404.

° Nub. Test.

p. 96, 97.

N. Alex.

p. 404.

P Permittan-

tur itaque pia

corda charo-

rum de suo-

rum mortibus

contristati dolore sanabili, &

consolabiles lachrymas fundant

conditione mortali, quos cito reprimat

Fidei Gaudium, Quà credunt Fideles,

quando moriuntur, paululum à Nobis abire &

ad MELIO-

RA TRANSIRE. D. Aug. Serm. 32. de Verbis Apostoli. p. 277. Edit. Erasmi. 1528.

I need not trouble my self with answering the rest of the passages<sup>a</sup> from St. Austin, not one of which does in the least insinuate a Romish Purgatory: would our Compiler but read St. Austin himself instead of Natalis Alexandre, Monsieur de Meaux, and such people, I am certain he would be of the same mind. I am sure St. Austin's Opinion was, (as it may be seen for example at the End of that thirty second Sermon, which our Compiler himself quotes<sup>o</sup>) That we ought to believe<sup>p</sup> that when the faithful die, and depart hence, they leave us onely for a little while, and pass unto the enjoyments of a much happier state than we are in here on Earth.

Isidore of Sevil's Testimony is of no value here, since He lived with, and after Gregory the Great, in whose time we own that a Purgatory began to be believed, and its flames to be blown up first.

q Nub. Test.

p. 98. N. Alex.

p. 411, 412.

As to the Practice of the Greek Church<sup>q</sup> who pray still for the Dead, it is as direct an Argument as could be urged, that the Ancients never believed a Purgatory notwithstanding their praying for the Dead, since the Greek Church who imitate them in those Prayers did after the pretended Union in the Council of Florence, and to this day do disown the being or belief of any such place as Purgatory, and charge the Latins with inventing it.

I will not trouble my self with any Observations upon Antiquity on this account, I desire the Reader onely to observe that the Prayers put up by the Ancients were for the best of Men, for the Martyrs themselves, for those whom they believed to be at Rest, in perfect Tranquillity, and with the Lord in his heavenly Kingdom, and therefore I think we ought to interpret those Wishes and Alms and Prayers for them as testifications onely of their Hope and of their Belief, that

that though they were gone hence, yet that they were still alive in the Lord; and of their Love to them, whereby they did hope that by their Prayers and Alms they could procure for their departed Brethren an increase of glory. I will conclude this point of debate with a passage out of that Letter<sup>r</sup> which the late most famous Antiquary Monsieur Spon wrote to Father Le Chaise, the present French King's Confessor, wherein he tells him, that though He had a vast number of Epitaphs of the first six hundred years, yet he could never find any mention made for the Remedy of Souls, which the Modern ones wish or desire for the Deceased, and that in all the ancient Bas-Reliefs which he had seen, He could never observe any Representation of Purgatory.

<sup>r</sup> In the Collection of Pieces at the end of Dr. Burnet's History of the Regale, p. 205, 206.

## CH A P. VI.

### Concerning Transubstantiation.

#### SECT. I.

THE next point under debate our Compiler sets about is Transubstantiation, wherein he entertains his Reader with a long story about Berengarius, and the Synods against him. I question not but a great many of the Readers of the *Nubes Testium* have looked upon the Author thereof to be an extraordinary learned man for his quoting so great variety of very curious, and very rare Authors, but I can assure them, that, had he had that Ingenuity which Pliny the younger requires in a borrower, he must have set Natalis Alexandre's name at the beginning, and at the end of his tedious story, for out of his Dissertation de *Causa Berengarii* it is, that our Compiler hath furnished his Reader's with the large account of Berengarius.

To what purpose all this stir about Berengarius is made, I cannot understand, since we do freely own that that excellent and orthodox person was opposed by a great many of those who passed for learned men in those days; and that the Bishops of Rome falling in with the faction against him made such a noise with Synods about him, and forc't him to subscribe Confessions, the First of which under

under *Nicholas the Second* was not *only* a *sottish*, but a *blasphemous* one; and therefore our *Compiler* had the wit not to put it down in his *Collection*. It were easie to shew, how little these *Confessions* agreed with one another, but especially with the *present Sentiments* and *practices* of the *Church of Rome*, but that is too large a *Subject* to be undertaken here? As to *Berengarius* his being opposed by the *Learned Men* of his time, from which our *Compiler* would gather the certainty of his having been in a great *Error*; if this be a good *Argument* that *Berengarius* was in the wrong, it will hold as strongly, that *Transubstantiation* it self is an *error*, since that daring *Monk Paschasius Radbertus* (who first dreamt of, and exposed this *Monster* to the world) was opposed as much by the *Learned Men* of his time. If *Adelmannus*<sup>a</sup>, *Hugo*<sup>b</sup>, *Lanfrank*<sup>c</sup>, and *Durand*<sup>d</sup> wrote against *Berengarius*; *Joannes Scotus Erigena* and *Rhathramn* (who both wrote at the command of the *Emperour Charles the Bald*). *Amalarinus*, and *Walafride*<sup>e</sup> *Sirabo*, *Rabanus Maurus* and *Heribald* with others wrote and taught directly against the *Novel Opinion* of *Paschasius*: so that should we compare the *Writers* which wrote for that *Doctrine* which *Berengarius* afterwards taught, with those that wrote against him, all *Learned Men* will grant that *Berengarius* had vastly the advantage of his *Adversaries*, since those who wrote for his *Doctrine* against *Paschasius* did so far excell in *Learning* those that did oppose him, since the *Scotus's*, the *Rhathramn's*, and the *Rabanus's* were men of infinite more worth and learning than the *Adelman's*, the *Durand's*, and the *Lanfrank's*, the last of whom tells the formal silly story about two *Heresies*<sup>e</sup> started about the *Flesh* of the *Son of Man*, which the *Sacramental Bread* was to be converted into, and makes the *Council of Ephesus* to have been procured for the suppression of those two *Heresies*; which is such a forged and ridiculous piece of stuff, as shews what learned *Adversaries* *Berengarius* was like to have, when the most learned of them all is guilty of such ignorance.

It is not worth while to confute either *Lanfrank's*, or any of the other *Author's Arguments* against *Berengarius* set down by our *Compiler*: he knows we do not derive our *Doctrine* from *Berengarius*, and he might know, would he consult our *Protestant Writers*, that we have evidently shewn that *Berengarius* was no starter of a new *Doctrine*, but that what *Berengarius* stood up for in the *Eleventh Century*, had always been the *Doctrine* of the *Catholic Church*: and this some of his own *Church* are so far satisfied of, that One of them,

who

<sup>a</sup> Nub. Test.

<sup>b</sup> p. 100.

<sup>c</sup> p. 102.

<sup>d</sup> p. 104.

<sup>e</sup> p. 103.

<sup>e</sup> Lanfran.  
de Euch. Sacr.  
in Tom. 6.  
Biblioth. PP.  
p. 203, 204.  
Edit. 1624.

who is said to be a person of very great note in France at present, did but the other day shew in an historical manner, that the Belief of our Church concerning the blessed Eucharist was the Belief of the Catholick Church for a thousand years after Christ, and that we ought not to be obliged to believe their Transubstantiation, since it wanted what they themselves made necessary for any Catholick Doctrine at the Council of Trent, the Tradition, to wit, of the Church of all Ages.

Setting then aside their objecting to us Berengarius in the Eleventh Century, and our objecting to them Paschasius Radbertus in the Ninth Century, whose opinion was so learnedly and so invincibly baffled by the famous Rhathramn as soon as it made any stir in the World; let us pass on to that, which we both so eagerly contend for in this point, the Sentiments and Doctrines of the first six Centuries about the Eucharist.

I think the Controversie might be sufficiently determined from Scripture it self, where the Eucharist is so often noted by Breaking of Bread in the Acts of the Apostles, and St. Paul does so often call it Bread after Consecration: but since our Compiler waves all proofs from Scripture, and appeals to the Doctrine and Belief of the Primitive Fathers of the first six hundred years, I am very willing to attend his Motions, and to join issue with him herein.

The Question betwixt our Church and theirs may be stated in a very few words, it is not whether Christ's Body be really present in the Eucharist, which he knows we declare to be our Opinion, since we believe that the consecrated Elements do by the appointment of God communicate to every faithfull Receiver the Body and Blood of Christ: but the real debate betwixt us is, whether the Bread and Wine upon Consecration are transubstantiated into that very Body and Blood of Christ which was nailed and poured out upon the Cross, or in other words, whether after Consecration there is no other Substance there but the Natural Body and Blood of Christ. This they of the Church of Rome affirm, and this is what our Compiler must prove to have been the Belief and Doctrine of the first six hundred years, if he intends to convince us.

Our Compiler hath amassed together so great a number of Testimonies upon this point, with which he fills up forty pages, that should I oblige my self to a particular Examination of every one of his Testimonies, it would make a book as large as all I shall gather against his whole Treatise; I will therefore, to shorten my



task, but much more to deliver my Reader from a tedious repetition of the same Answers to those Testimonies which speak onely over again what was said before, answer those that are of most moment and Authority, and refer the rest unto the same classes with them.

He is very carefull to follow his Guide, Natalis Alexandre, out of whom he transcribes every syllable of his Testimonies for forty pages together, except two small passages out of St. Austin, which do not occur, as far as I have observed, in that long Dissertation; yet is so cunning very often to curtail those parts of the Testimonies which he thought, I suppose, did speak too broad against them.

## SECT. II.

<sup>a</sup> Nub. Testim., p. 109. Nat. Alex. in Par. 3. Sec. 11, & 12. Dissertatio 12. p. 476.

The Compiler <sup>a</sup> and his Guide also begin with St. Ignatius, who is quoted bringing in the reason why the Hereticks abstained from Communion, because they did not confess that the

Eucharist was the flesh of Christ. I have sufficiently answered this passage in my Preface, by turning it upon my late Adversary, from the Authority of Irenæus <sup>b</sup> who explains the Eucharistia here by Bread which had been blessed, and Origen <sup>c</sup> who speaks of the Christians having a Bread which was called Eucharistia; so that we say that the Eucharist or Blessed Bread is the Flesh of Jesus Christ, but that this must be figuratively onely, since Bread can no otherwise be the Body of Christ and Bread still at the same time.

<sup>b</sup> ...cum PANEM in quo gratia ad se sint CORPUS esse DOMINI SUI. Iren. adv. Hæret. 4. c. 34.  
<sup>c</sup> Orig. contra Cellsum, l. 8.  
<sup>d</sup> Nubes Test. p. 110. Nat. Alex. p. 479.

The second Testimony from Ignatius falls in with the first, so that I must pass to our Compiler's next <sup>d</sup> from Justin Martyr, the strength of which lyes onely in his saying, they were taught that the consecrated food was the Flesh and Blood of Jesus Christ; We have already granted that it is; however, to corroborate what we said above, it is evident to a demonstration that this consecrated Food was still Bread, and not transubstantiated into the Natural Body and Blood of Christ, because St. <sup>e</sup> Justin says at the same time and in the same sentence, that our bodies are NOURISHED by that very consecrated Food; to affirm which of the Natural Flesh of Christ is impious and detestable.

<sup>e</sup> — τῶν καὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ τῶν ἐσθίων, ΕΞ ἧς αἵμα καὶ σὰρξ καὶ μέλας βολῶν ΤΡΕΦΟΝΤΑΙ ἡμεῖς, — Ἰησοῦ καὶ Σάββα καὶ Αἵμα ἰησοῦ καὶ Σαββα Mart. Apolog. 2. p. 98. Edit. Paris. 1636.

St. Irenæus<sup>f</sup> must be answered in the same way, since when he says, that the Bread is the Body of Christ and the Cup his Blood, he does also tell us<sup>g</sup> that the Body of Man is nourished by that same consecrated Bread and Wine, and urges it for an argument that our Bodies shall rise again, because they have been nourished by the Body and Blood of Christ: every syllable of which is directly against any Transubstantiation.

The two Testimonies from St. Cyprian<sup>h</sup> are of no weight, since<sup>i</sup> they only call this Sacrament the Body and Blood of Christ, as all the rest hitherto have done: And thus our Compiler hath brought us through the three first Centuries of the Church, those Golden Ages, whose Testimonies we so much value and admire; out of whom the Reader may see, that he hath not brought one passage which is not directly against himself. He begins the next Centuries with the Council of Nice<sup>1</sup> which says but what Ignatius did, when it calls the Eucharist the Body of Christ: as to Her farther Testimony from Gelasius Cyzicenus<sup>k</sup>, about not minding the Bread and Wine before us, but raising our minds by Faith to consider the Lamb of God offered without shedding of blood by the Priests; the sense of this passage is no other than, that Communicants by Faith should represent to themselves the Offering of the Lamb of God, and that receiving the precious Body and Blood of that Lamb of God; they should believe them to be the Pledges of their Resurrection: and had our Compiler but had the Ingenuity to have transcribed the two next lines to these out of his Master, Father Alexandre, Every one would at first blush have seen, that, by the precious Body and Blood of the Lamb of God which the Faithfull were to receive here into their mouths, was not meant Christ's true Natural Body, but his Figurative or Symbolical Body, the consecrated<sup>l</sup> Elements of Bread and Wine, since they are advised to take but a small portion of his Body and Blood, remembering that they did receive not to satisfy nature, or to fill themselves, but to sanctify themselves: it is sense to talk of receiving little or much of the consecrated Elements; but, I am sure, it is far from it to talk of taking a little or much of the true Natural Body of Christ.

<sup>f</sup> Nubes Testium, p. III. Nat. Alex. p. 485, 486, 487.

<sup>g</sup> — Sic & nostra corpora ex EA [viz. EUCHARISTIA] NUTRITA & reposita in terram & resoluta in ea, resurgent in suo tempore. St. Iren. l. 5. c. 11. Edit. Fevard.

<sup>h</sup> Nub. Test. p. 111, 112. Nat. Alexan. p. 497, 501.

<sup>i</sup> Nubes Testium, p. 112. Nat. Alex. p. 506.

<sup>k</sup> Nub. Test. p. 113. Nat. Alex. p. 506, 507.

<sup>l</sup> Propter hoc enim neque multum accipimus, sed parum, ut sciamus quod non ad satietatem, sed ad sanctimoniam sumimus. Gelasius Cyzic. in Nat. Alexandri, Dissert. 12. in Par. 3. Sec. 11, & 12. p. 507.

<sup>m</sup> Nubes Test.

p. 113.

Nat. Alex.

p. 510.

*Eusebius's first Testimony*<sup>m</sup> will not serve our Compiler's purpose, since People do not use to celebrate the *memory* of that thing which is really present it self at the same time, and therefore the Sacrifice spoken of in this Testimony is only a Commemoration of that Sacrifice on the Cross once offered, and the Opposition here is put betwixt this commemorative Sacrifice, and those legal signs and figures which did not contain or exhibit the Truth it self; and not betwixt the natural Body of Christ, and the Sign or Figure of it: for Eusebius doth in another

<sup>n</sup> Ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου Συμβόλου τοῦ ἰδίου τοῦ αὐτοῦ. Euseb. Demonsf. Evangel. l. 8. p. 380. Edit. Parif. 1628.

part of this Work<sup>n</sup> tell us that our Lord commanded to make use of Bread for the Symbol or Sign of his Body. The next Testimony from him (Nub. Test. p. 113. Nat. Alex. p. 518.) falls in with Ignatius and the rest.

<sup>o</sup> Nub. Test.

p. 114.

Nat. Alexan.

p. 519.

St. Hilary<sup>o</sup> hath expressed himself in the next Testimony in a manner very different from the Fathers that were before him, to reconcile him with whom, I think, his words ought to be extended no farther than to denote that in the Eucharist we do really receive the Body and Blood of Christ; I am sure He did not believe any Annihilation of the Elements or any Transubstantiation of them, when in his Comments on St. Matthew, observing that Judas did not communicate with

<sup>p</sup> Neque sane bibere cum eo poterat, qui non erat bibiturum in regno, cum universos, tum bibentes ex vitis istius fructu, bibituros secum postea polliceretur. D. Hilary. Comment. in Matth. Canon. 30. p. 435. Edit. Erasmi. 1523.

the rest of the Apostles at the first Institution of the Eucharist, he gives the reason of it, because he was not fit to drink<sup>p</sup> with our Saviour then, who was not to drink with him in his Kingdom; which thing our Saviour had promised that all the rest should, who did then DRINK of the FRUIT of THIS VINE. If it was Wine which they drank in the first

Institution of the Eucharist, it was certainly Bread which was broken by our Saviour, and eaten by them.

<sup>q</sup> Nub. Test.

p. 114, 115.

Nat. Alexan.

p. 524, 525,

527.

<sup>r</sup> Ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ

ἁγίῳ Ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου

ἁγίου τοῦ αὐτοῦ

ἁγίου, ὅτι ἐν

τῷ αὐτῷ αὐτοῦ

ἁγίῳ τοῦ αὐτοῦ

ἁγίου. D. Cy-

ril. Catech.

Myst. 4. p. 237.

Edit. Par.

1640.

The following large Testimony from St. Cyril<sup>q</sup> of Jerusalem, which speaks of the Bread's being the Body of Christ, and that we ought not to look upon it after Consecration as naked and common Bread, is what we all believe as well as any Romanist: however, though we must not look on it after Consecration as common Bread, yet we may look upon it as blessed Bread; and though we must not look on it then as naked Bread, yet we must look on it still as Bread, or else instead of saying that it was not common Bread, St. Cyril must have said that it is not Bread at all; which thing he was as far from thinking as from saying here, where he tells his Auditors, that<sup>r</sup> under the Type or Symbol of Bread, they

were.

were made Partakers of the Body of Christ, and under the Symbol of Wine, they did receive his Blood.

There is no man, who hath read Cyril himself, that can be ignorant how in the *Mystagogical Catechism*, next before this quoted by our Compiler, St. Cyril speaks as great and as extraordinary things of the Chrism-oil for Confirmation, and yet I never met with or heard of that Person, who believed that either Cyril himself, or any body else upon his words, did believe that the Oil was transubstantiated when it was made Chrism.

St. Basil's Authorities <sup>r</sup> are not worth considering, since they onely made this Sacrament to be the Body and Blood of Christ, and to be more excellent than the Sacrifices of Bulls and Goats; which is denyed by none of us. The next large passage from his Brother St. Gregory Nyssen <sup>t</sup> makes directly against our Compiler, and so would every Reader have seen, had our Compiler but had the honesty to have set down the whole passage of Gregory Nyssen, as his Master F. Alexandre had done. The design of the whole passage is to shew, how man that consists of two parts, body and soul, may in both of them become immortal; for the soul, He makes its being joined by Faith unto Christ to be the means of its attaining Salvation and Immortality; but for the body, which had been poisoned and made mortal by sin, Gregory Nyssen makes the Reception of the Body and Blood of Christ into our Stomach, and the Dispersion of the Sacrament into our several parts, to be necessary to our Bodies being cured of that poison which had affected every part of our bodies, and to their being made immortal.

All this is but what Irenæus said so long before, and this nourishing of our Bodies in a strict and proper sense cannot without Blasphemy be attributed to the Natural Body and Blood of Christ.

The next passage from the same Father in our Compiler <sup>v</sup> is made up of Scraps out of a fair large quotation in his Master F. Alexandre, and cannot be fairly and clearly understood without the rest, which however I shall not trouble my self to set down, since it falls in with the reasoning of the first Testimony from this Father, and the Answer to that is as futable to this last.

As to the last Testimony from Gregory Nyssen <sup>\*</sup>, I grant that this Father speaks of a Change in the Elements, in order to their being made the Body and Blood of Christ, but that He means no change of the substance of these Elements of Bread and Wine, but merely a change of their Quality and Virtue, is evident from his Comparisons of

<sup>r</sup> Nub. Test.  
p. 116.  
Nat. Alex.  
p. 528.

<sup>t</sup> Nub. Test.  
p. 116, 117.  
Nat. Alex.  
p. 530.

<sup>v</sup> Nubes Test.  
p. 118.  
Nat. Alex.  
p. 532, 533.

<sup>\*</sup> Nubes Test.  
p. 118.  
Nat. Alexan.  
p. 537.

of the change in this Sacrament to the changes of Water in the other  
 \* Greg. Nyss. *Sacrament of Baptism, of a Priest upon Ordination*\*, of an Altar upon  
 Orat. in Bapt. its Dedication, of the Oil for Confirmation; none of which is believed  
 tism. Christi, by any man of sense to be transubstantiated, but onely to receive a  
 p. 802, 803. change of their Use, Quality and Virtue; and therefore this last In-  
 Ed. Par. 1615. stance of our Compiler's from this Father is very impertinent, since  
 in that very Oration about Baptism, the change of the Elements in  
 the Eucharist is made use of as one Instance among the rest of a  
 change made in Virtue and Quality onely.

He that will be at the pains to read that Oration over will  
 find it as evident as the Sun at midday, that when Gregory Nyss-  
 sen talks of the changes there, He neither means nor contends for  
 any other change than that which we believe doth happen to the  
 Elements upon Consecration, to wit, a change in their Use, Quali-  
 ty and Virtue.

Our Compiler hath mangled also the next Testimony from Ephrem  
 y Nubes Test. Syrus y, but to no purpose at all, since notwithstanding all his  
 p. 118. care, Ephrem Syrus is as exprest against their Doctrines as we can  
 Nat. Alexan. desire, He teaches here, that the Receiving of the Body and Blood of  
 p. 541. Christ is to be procured by Faith, which this Father makes the Instru-  
 ment of conveying them to us; which is sufficiently plain against  
 our Compiler's Church, which will have the Wicked to receive the  
 Body and Blood of Christ as well as the Faithfull.

The two next Testimonies from St. Optatus and Gaudentius\* are not  
 \* Nubes Test. against us; they fall in with St. Ignatius, and are considered there;  
 p. 119. and, which is more, are confirmed by our Compiler's second Testi-  
 Nat. Alexan. mony\* from Gaudentius, which acquaints us, that it was consecra-  
 p. 550, 552. ted Bread (and therefore Bread still) which our Lord gave to his  
 \* Nubes Test. Disciples, and said, This is my Body †.

† Cum PANEM consecratum & VINUM Discipulis suis porrigeret, sic ait, Hoc est  
 Corpus; Hic est Sanguis meus. St. Gaudent. Tract. 2. in Exod.

### SECT. III.

Having hitherto observed with diligence our Compiler, and ex-  
 amined particularly his several Quotations for Transubstantiation, I  
 should be as tedious to the Reader as troublesome to my self, if  
 I should take the same method in examining the rest of his Testimo-  
 nies which do follow; and indeed there will be little occasion  
 for it, since the rest of his Quotations upon this Subject are either  
 very vain or very much forced, to make an appearance for Tran-  
 sub-



*substantiation.* It would be very irksome to answer particularly every one of his numerous Quotations from St. Chrysostome<sup>a</sup>: it is almost a sufficient answer to say, that they are every one of them (except the two small ones out of his Book, *De Sacerdotio*) taken out of his Homilies, wherein all Learned Men know and own that that Father did indulge too much to the warmth of his fruitful fancy, and to the very heights of Rhetorick and Eloquence: and therefore those towering expressions must be allowed for as rhetorical flights, and those passages (which seem the nearest to the Doctrine of Transubstantiation) must be taken in a figurative sense, because spoken allegorically, and many of them with a very big hyperbole. I would desire of any man of Learning and Ingenuity whether he thinks St. Chrysostome did believe himself, or would have others to take him in a literal sense in most of the Quotations set down by our Compiler, when (for example) He talks of their seeing Christ's Garment; when He tells those that were desirous of seeing Christ's shape, form, cloaths and shoes, that they did see him, that they did touch him, and that they did eat him; when He talks of the Tongues of the Communicants being purpled or dyed with our Saviour's tremendous Blood; when He talks of their not only touching and eating our blessed Saviour, but of their fastening their teeth into his Flesh.

I must confess that I cannot (though F. Alexandre and from him our Compiler it seems could) transcribe these passages without a sacred horror, and that I cannot but think that Holy Father did wonderfully transgress the Rules of true Eloquence, since, I think, such extravagant expressions are apter to excite a horror of the Thing, much more than a Love of Christ in our Hearts. However, after all these rhetorical, hyperbolical and figurative Declamations, we are very certain that this good Father was far from believing a Transubstantiation; since in a point of Controversie, and in cold blood as it were, when he was securing his Friend against the Apollinarian Hereſie, He does urge the Continuation of the Elements of Bread and Wine in their own proper substance after their Consecration for an Argument against that Hereſie<sup>b</sup>; which thing He could not have done, had He believed himself, that the Elements of Bread and Wine upon Consecration were transubstantiated into the Natural Body and Blood of Christ.

I need not spend more words about the Testimonies from our Compiler's next Father, Saint Ambrose, the first<sup>c</sup> of which onely runs a Comparison betwixt this our Sacrament and the Jews Manna,

and

<sup>a</sup> Nubes Test.  
p. 120, 121,  
122, &c.  
Nat. Alexan.  
p. 554, 555,  
556, &c.

<sup>b</sup> D. Chryſ.  
Epistola ad  
Cæſar. Mo-  
nachum.

<sup>c</sup> Nubes Test.  
p. 128, 129.  
Nat. Alexan.  
p. 579.

and, very deservedly, prefers the *first* as most beneficial. As for the *rest* of the Testimonies from *this Father* <sup>d</sup>: to be brief, I say, that we own a *change* in the *Elements* of *Bread and Wine* upon *Consecration*, and that *St. Ambrose* does fitly call in the *Omnipotence* of *God* to prove it, since we believe that *all the Powers* in the *World* were not able to institute *this Sacrament* to such a purpose, were not able to give to *Bread* (which was *common* before) upon the *pronouncing* of a few words and *Prayers*, the *Virtue* and *Efficacy* to communicate to a *faithfull Receiver* the *Body and Blood* of our *Saviour*, all the *benefits* of his *meritorious Death* and *Passion*; That *St. Ambrose* contended for, nor meant any other change is evident from the *4<sup>th</sup> Book*, (if his,) *de Sacramentis*, where contending in the *same manner*, and upon the *same Topick*, for a *change*, He demands

<sup>e</sup> Si ergo tanta vis est in Ser-  
mone Domini Jesu, ut inciperent es-  
se quæ non erant, quanto magis ope-  
ratorum est, ut sint quæ erant &  
in aliud commutentur, D. Am-  
brof. de Sacram. l. 4. c. 4.

to know <sup>e</sup> whether the *Word of God*, which was able to give those things a *Being* which had none before, was not much more able to make these *Elements* to continue what they were, [which must be as to their *Substance*] and yet to change them into another thing [which must be as to their *Quality*

and *Use*:] and this *St. Ambrose* farther proves, when quick-ly after this He compares the change in the *Elements* to that of a person baptized, whom no body believes to be changed as to his *Substance*, but onely as to the *Quality* and *Disposition* of his *Soul* and *Life*. I will add no more than that in this *same fourth Book*, *de Sacramentis*; this *Father* <sup>f</sup> calls this *Sacrament* the *FIGURE* of the *Body and Blood* of our *Lord Jesus Christ*.

<sup>f</sup> Fac nobis  
hanc Oblatio-  
nem — ac-  
ceptabilem, quod est Figura, Corporis &  
Sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi.  
l. 4. c. 5.

D. Ambr. de Sacram.

The following Testimonies from *St. Hierome* are easily answered, by telling our *Compiler* <sup>g</sup>, that the *Body of Christ* which the *Priests* are said to make is his *Sacramental* or *Figurative*, not his *Natural Body*; to say, a *Priest* can make the *Natural Body of Christ*, is, I think, too horrid to be owned by any that pretend either to *Christianity* or *common sense*: and this *Father* doth sufficiently explain himself, when he says <sup>h</sup>, that the *Bread* which our *Lord* brake and gave his *Disciples* is his *Body*.

<sup>h</sup> Nos autem  
audiamus  
PANE M,  
quem fregit Dominus,  
deditque Discipulis suis,  
ESSE CORPUS Domini, &c.  
D. Hier. Ep. ad  
Hedib.

I do not see one Testimony from *St. Austin* worth staying upon, we all believe that the *faithfull* do eat the *Flesh* and drink the *Blood* of *Christ*,

Christ, but there is not a word in all of them<sup>1</sup> about the Bread<sup>1</sup> and Wine's being transubstantiated; and no wonder, since among the Fathers there is not One more direct against Transubstantiation in forty places of his Works than St. Austin; I will but mention one very short passage, but so plain and so direct as ought to be sufficient to have prevented the Romanists ever bringing St. Austin on the stage as a Patron of, or Friend to their Transubstantiation: it is from his Book against Adamantus, where He tells us<sup>k</sup> that our Lord<sup>k</sup> made no difficulty to say, This is my Body, when he gave his Disciples the Sign of his Body.

*Corpus meum, cum Signum daret Corporis sui.* D. Aug. con. Adam. c. 12.

St. Isidore Pelusiota's Testimony<sup>1</sup> hath been answered too often to take up any room here. And those Quotations from St. Cyril of Alexandria might have been spared also, had our Compiler known the Design of them<sup>m</sup> St. Cyril's design in those Books (out of which F. Alexandre and from him our Compiler have gathered all the Testimonies in the Nubes Testium) was to prove that the Humanity of Christ is personally united to his Divinity, and He urges Nestorius with this Argument among the rest, that in the Eucharist we are made Partakers of the Life-giving Body of Christ, that no flesh could have such a power but what was personally united to the Eternal Word of God.

This is the purport of St. Cyril's reasoning hence, and now what is all this towards the proving that the Bread and Wine are transubstantiated into the Natural Body and Blood of Christ? where is there a word in all these large passages set down by our Compiler that speaks any such thing? There are some of these very passages which are so far from helping to prove a Transubstantiation, that they do suppose the direct contrary: I will instance onely in that of the<sup>n</sup> Son's being united to us by the Mystical Eucharist, or as it is expressed in the fourth Book of his Comments upon St. John, That by the Eucharist we do receive the Son of God himself<sup>o</sup> in us. If there be Transubstantiation either taught, or believed here, then by the Body of Christ we receive the Body of

<sup>1</sup> Nub. Test. p. 140. N. Alex. p. 676, 677.

<sup>m</sup> Nub. Test. p. 140, 141, 142. N. Alex. p. 678, 679, 681, 682, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 690, &c.

<sup>n</sup> Ἰνέεται μὲν δὲ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ υἱὸς  
--- πνευματικῶς τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ τῆς  
Μυστικῆς. Cyr. Alex. in Joann. l. 11.  
p. 1001. Edit. Par. 1638.

<sup>o</sup> — Ὡς τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν αὐτὴν ὡς  
ἐαυτὴν ἀρχαῖοι τὴν ἴδιαν. Idem  
in Joan. l. 4. p. 364.

*Christ, and the Body of Christ is made the Instrument of conveying to us the Body of Christ; which is admirable stuff, but such as the Romanists must own, who say that the Eucharist is the Natural Body and Blood of Christ. I cannot insist longer on such an absurdity, but must pass on to the Testimony from Proclus* <sup>¶</sup> *which is directly against our Compiler, since it is the Presence of the Holy Ghost, and not of the natural Body and Blood of Christ that (according to him)* <sup>¶</sup> *makes the Elements to become the Body and Blood of Christ.*

¶ Nub. Test.

p. 145.

N. Alex.

p. 698.

¶ Δὲ τῶν

τῶν στοιχείων

ἑκταίονται

τῶν ἁγίων

σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ σωτήρος

Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

τῶν ἁγίων σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ σωτήρος, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Proclus CP. de Trad. D. Litur. p. 581.

The next Authority from St. Leo (Nub. Test. p. 147, ex N. Alexandro, p. 700.) is not worth considering; And as to the other Quotations from the Homilies that go under the name of Eusebius Emisenus the Semi-Arian <sup>†</sup>, I answer that were they really His, yet They ought not to be admitted in this Controversie, but since they are certainly believed by our Writers, and owned by the Romanish Writers not to be the Work of Eusebius Emisenus, and since it is uncertain when these Homilies were first drawn up, We cannot admit Them to any Authority or place within these six first Centuries, and therefore need not trouble our Readers with any Answer unto them.

† Nub. Test.

p. 147, 148,

149. N. Alex.

p. 710, 711,

712.

The last Passages from Isidore of Sevil <sup>†</sup> speak nothing to the purpose of a Transubstantiator: we grant that Christians are obliged to offer the same Sacrifice which Christ instituted; and that Sacrifice was a Commemoration of his most meritorious Passion (to be undergone the next day) for all men: but how Transubstantiation can be proved hence is what I am far from being able to see. I am sure St. Isidore was of the contrary Opinion, when speaking of the Eucharist, He said that the Substance <sup>‡</sup> of the Visible Bread and Wine doth nourish and exhilarate the outward man, (that is, our Bodies), as the Word of God, the Living Bread doth nourish the Souls of the faithful Communicants.

† Nub. Test.

p. 150.

N. Alex.

p. 714, 715.

‡ Sic ut Vi-

gibilis Panis

& Vini sub-

stantia exte-

riorem nutrit

& inebriat

hominem: ita Verbum Dei, qui est Panis Vivus, participatione sui Fidelium recreat mentes. S. Ili-

doct. Hispal. apud Rathramal Lib. de Corp. & Sang. Dom. p. 120. Edit. Par. Boileu. 1686.

hominem: ita Verbum Dei, qui est Panis Vivus, participatione sui Fidelium recreat mentes. S. Ili-

I have now gone through *all the Testimonies* produced by our Compiler in order to the proving that *Transubstantiation* was as much the belief of the first six hundred years of the Christian Church, as it is now of the Church of Rome; and I cannot but appeal to the Reader, how little these numerous Testimonies have advantaged the Roman Cause, and how far any of them hath been from proving the belief in those best days of the Church of any *Transubstantiation*: it had been easie for me here to have produced abundance of passages out of those Fathers which our Compiler hath quoted, and out of other Eminent Fathers whom he hath omitted, to evidence how far Antiquity was from knowing, or believing any such monstrous thing as *Transubstantiation*; I could not onely have produced their Opinions, but their Practices also upon Record directly against any *Transubstantiation*, as, for example, the making *Plasters* of the Eucharist; their mingling the Consecrated Wine with their Ink, to make their Subscriptions more authentick and solemn; their burying the Eucharist with their Dead; their ordering the Eucharist to be burnt, if kept till it were stale or mouldy; but as I have not leisure nor room here to produce those convincing Authorities of the Ancients, so neither need I to insist farther on these Practices which speak so loudly, how far the Christian World was then from believing the Eucharist to be (through *Transubstantiation*) the Natural Body and Blood of our blessed and glorified Saviour.

I cannot however pass by without a Remark that Practice of burning the Eucharist, if it had been kept too long. This was formally provided here in England (for Example) in the Tenth Century near a Thousand years after Christ by the thirty eighth of the Canons of our Church<sup>a</sup> made in King Edgar's Reign; And yet, to let the world see what a sort of Enemies Berengarius met with in the very next Century; when that Champion for the Primitive Doctrine about the Eucharist urged upon his Adversaries a Matter of Fact, that the Eucharist was corruptible, whereas the Natural Body and Blood of Christ were owned by all to be incorruptible: Guismund the Archbishop of Aversa (who was one of his Antagonists) denies very briskly the matter of Fact, and falls

<sup>a</sup> Docemus etiam, ut Sacerdos semper habeat preparatam (prout opus fuerit) Eucharistiam, & hanc in puritate custodiat, caveatque ne inveniasecat. Sin diutius reservata fuerit quam oportuit, & ut nauseam pariat, comburetur tunc in puro igne, &c. Can. 38. sub Edgardo apud Spelm. Concilia Ton. 1. p. 452.



<sup>b</sup> Berengarius dicit : caro Christi incorruptibilis est, Sacramenta vero Altaris, si diuini seruentur, possunt corrumpi. VIDENTUR ENIM PUTREFIERI. (now follows the Reply) O calumniosa lingua, o lingua blasphemis assueta : promptior ad extorquendam superbe de Scripturis Dei suam perditionem, &c. Gultmundus Archiep. Avers. de Verit. Euchar. l. 2. p. 228, 229. apud Tom. 6. Biblioth. PP. Edit. Par. 1624.

most outrageously <sup>b</sup> upon Berengarius for it, and exclaims without measure against his calumniating and blasphemous Tongue, and goes on railing against poor Berengarius, as if he had been guilty of the most impious falsity : whereas if Berengarius's Tongue was blasphemous for urging a matter of Fact, which the Practice of the Church had given sufficient Testimony to, in ordering the Eucharist to be burnt that was corrupted, I am sure Gultmund's Pen was not inexcusable to say no worse of it, but altogether unbecoming a Christian, much more an Archbishop.

I will stay no longer upon this Point which hath been so much, and so invincibly exposed ; if any desire farther satisfaction herein, I must refer him to our late Treatises on that Subject, and if he would see Transubstantiation proved not to have been the sense of the Primitive Church in a lesser compass, I refer him to the twenty fifth Chapter of *Veteres Vindicati* in answer to Mr. Sclater of Putney.

## C H A P. VII.

### Concerning Images.

#### S E C T. I.

**I** Have now left upon my hands but one other of the Points at present under debate : it is a point which gives so much offence to a great part of the World who are Christians, and is such an Obstacle to a greater part who would or might become Christians : I speak of the Worship of Images, which they of the Church of Rome contend so much for, and which we of the Reformation cannot contend too much against. Our Compiler ushers in this Controversie with a large account about the warm debates for and against Images in the Eighth and Ninth Centuries of the Church : his Margin to this account is so painted with Authorities for all he says in it, that it would look like envy, and a piece of very ill nature to deny his

his being very well read in the *History* of those times, were I not very well assured that all this is but borrowed, and that this ungratefull *Plagium* ought to be exposed, and the world told, that this formal Account, and these Marginal Notes are all taken out of his old Master *F. Alexandre* <sup>2</sup>.

<sup>a</sup> Natalis Alexandri Se-

calum 8. Cap. 2. Artic. 1. de Iconoclastarum Hæresi, p. 65, 66, 67, 70, 71, &c.

I must doe our Compiler however this right to let the Reader know that He discovers something more of Discretion in this Account than his Master himself: our Compiler <sup>\*</sup> begins his account with telling his Reader that the Jews, Marcionites, Manichees and Theopaschits had always shew'd themselves profess'd Enemies of Holy Images: but his Master *F. Alexandre* tells us a greater piece of news, that the Gentiles as well as <sup>b</sup> Jews, Marcionites, Manichees and Theopaschits had of a long time, or (as our Compiler translates *jam olim*) always been enemies of the Holy Images. I think this about the Pagans being such enemies to Images is a Discovery, and a thing which few people would have thought or hit on: but so it is, if we may believe *F. Alexandre*, and therefore his Transcriber was to blame not to let his English Reader hear of it, that so he might know, whom we herd with that are such enemies to Images, and that he might upon occasion call Protestants either Pagans or Iconoclasts, since they are all of a humour, and in the same faction against Holy Images.

<sup>\*</sup> Nub. Test. p. 151.

<sup>b</sup> Nat. Alex. ibidem, p. 65. Gentiles, Judæi, Marcionitæ, Manichæi, Theopaschitæ jam olim Sacris Imaginibus bellum indixere, &c.

It is not my business to examine this account of the Quarrels in the Eighth Century about Images: it is owned that in that Century as one part of the Church by a large Council of Bishops did put a stop to, and utterly forbid the making and Worship of Images, which was an Evil then creeping into the Church; so after them another Synod at Nice did endeavour to undoe what those religious Bishops had appointed, and did command that Images should be put into Churches, and be worshipped there: But it must be remembered also that this last Conventicle of Nice was despised by the Western part of the Christian World, and her Definitions condemned in a Council of three hundred Bishops at Frankford under Charles the Great, who himself, or some by his Command, yet not without his Royal Assistance did with so much learning and accuracy fully confute all the Pleas and grounds for Images made use of by that Conventicle at Nice.

And

And as to our own Nation so far were They from submitting to what had been enacted at Nice, that, when the Emperor Charles the Great transmitted hither the Definitions of the Synod at Nice to Offa King of Mercia, Hoveden<sup>c</sup> tells us that the Church of God [here] did abominate and abhor what they had enacted at Nice about the Adoration of Images, and that the famous Alcuin wrote and carried a Letter in the name of the Bishops and Princes of England to that Emperor; wherein from the Sacred Authority of Scripture Alcuin baffled the Adoration of Images.

<sup>c</sup> --- Imagines Adorari debere, quod omnino Ecclesia Dei excratur. Contra quod scripsit Albinus [Alcuinus r.] Epistolam ex autoritate Divinarum Scripturarum mirabiliter affirmatam; illamque cum eodem libro ex Persona Episcoporum, ac Principum nostrorum Regi Francorum attulit. R. Hoveden, Annal. Pars 1. p. 405. Edit. Wechel. 1601.

Passing therefore these things as nothing to the purpose of the present debate, which should be to shew that Images were not only used, but adored within, and during the first six Centuries after Christ: We challenge our Enemies to shew that the Church of God in those first ages did not only use, but worship Images.

Nubes Testi.  
p. 151.

Our Compiler manages the beginning of his account so slyly and in his old way, that I question not but most of his credulous and unthinking Readers do thereupon believe that Images were always used in the Catholick Church, and always worshipped by Her. The Jews (saith he) Marcionites, Manichees and Theopaschits had ALWAYS shew'd themselves profess'd Enemies of Holy Images, and had been industrious for the suppressing them among Christians. But in the year 723 the Jews with an unusual fury declared War against them, &c.

I appeal to all Learned men, whether most men would not hence believe that Images had always been used and worshipped in the Primitive Church; and I do not see why all that read him should not believe the same, since it is very natural for every one to argue thus with himself; that the Holy Images could not Always have been opposed by the Jews, Marcionites, and the other Hereticks, except they had Always been used and worshipped in the Church. If then our Compiler did thus believe himself, and had a mind to convey the same belief unto his Readers, I must tell him, that for all his reading of Father Alexandre's Books He discovers a great deal of ignorance in this thing, since what He writes here is a notorious falsehood: but if he pretends that his meaning only was that since Images were used in the Christian Church, they had always been opposed by

by those Jews and others, I must then assure him that He deals most disingenuously, and uses too much craft for an Honest Writer, while He suppresses that in this account, which could only keep his Readers from believing a gross untruth.

If our Compiler would do the Controversie about Image-Worship any true service, and keep within his own bounds, the Belief and Practice of the first five hundred years of the Church, He must shew, that, for those five hundred years as well as since, Images were not only used but worshipped by the Christians in their Assemblies.

How upable either our Compiler, or his Master Father Alexandre are to shew such a worship of Images then, is hence apparent in that they are not able to produce any Authour for the first three hundred years of the Church that speaks of Images either used, or worshipped in the Church of Christ during that space of time: I know our Compiler quotes Tertullian<sup>d</sup> but He is very unhappy in it, since all the world knows, that know any thing of Antiquity, that Tertullian was so far from speaking of the use of Images, or the Lawfulness of them among Christians or any people else, that he was against the very art of painting and making Images, and lookt upon it as utterly unlawfull, and universally forbidden<sup>e</sup> by God: and farther that place of Tertullian which our Compiler alludes to (for he does not give us Tertullian's, but his Master F. Alexandre's words) speaks not of any Image, but of a mere embleme engraven upon a Chalice.

<sup>d</sup> Nub. Test.  
p. 150.  
N. Alex.  
Dissertatio 6.  
in Sec. 8.  
p. 628.

<sup>e</sup> Idolum tam  
feri, quam  
coli Deus pro-  
hibet — Pro-  
pter hanc cau-  
sam ad eradi-  
candam scili-

cet materiam Idololatria, Lex Divina proclamat, Ne feceris Idolum: Et conjungens, neque similitudinem eorum quæ in calis sunt, &c. Toto mundo ejusmodi Artibus interdixit Servis Dei. Tert. de Idololat. c. 14. Edit. Franck.

As to the three Testimonies<sup>f</sup> about the Statue of our Saviour set up before her door by the Woman whom our Saviour cured of the Issue of Blood, our Compiler might very well have spared them, since Eusebius in the very next words to his account of it tells us that it was through her heathenism that she did this, and that upon the same ground the Painted Images of our Saviour and Peter and Paul were in many hands, which a heathenish gratitude had taught some to make to shew their respect to them.

<sup>f</sup> Nub. Test.  
p. 154, 155.  
N. Alex.  
p. 627, 624.

<sup>g</sup> Kai θαυ-  
μαστον ἰδὼν  
τοῦ πάλου  
ἰσθίων ἐνερ-  
γῆταις  
πρὸς τὴν σω-  
τῆρος ἡμῶν,

ταῦτα πεποιημένα· ὅτι καὶ ἡ Ἀποστολὴ αὐτῆς τῆς Εἰκόνας Παύλου καὶ Πέτρου, καὶ αὐτὴ δὴ τῇ Χειρὶ διὰ χειμάτων ἐν χειραῖς συγκράτας ἰσχυρομένη· ὡς εἶναι καὶ παλαιῶν ἀποστολικῶς οἷα Σωτῆρας ΕΘΝΙΚῇ ΣΤΗΝΘΕΙΑ· παρ' ἑαυτῆς τῶν πρῶτον εἰσδόντων τὴν τρεῖν-  
Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 7. c. 18. Edit. Valef.

All the following Testimonies about the Transient Sign, or Figures

<sup>h</sup> Nub. Test. p. 155, 156, 157. &c.  
N. Alex. in Panoplia Seculi septimi,  
p. 67, 68, 69, 70, 76, 71, 64, 65,  
77, 78, &c.

of the Cross used by Constantine the Great and afterwards; <sup>h</sup> are to no purpose, since our Compiler cannot shew withall that they were worshipped; if he could, why did he not; let him shew that as they used in Constantine's time the Figure of

the Cross, so They adored it; let him shew that the Ancients did practise what the Church of Rome now does, that They adored the Image of the Cross, and (which is far more according to themselves) that Latria was paid to it, which the Church of Rome now says <sup>i</sup> is due to it.

<sup>i</sup> Cruz Legati, quia

DEBETUR EI LATRIA, erit à dextris, &c. Pontificale Romanum, p. 480. col. 1. Edit. Romæ, 1611.

That the Reader may see the direct contrary Practice betwixt the Church of God in those days, and the Church of Rome at this present, I will produce onely St. Ambrose's account of Helena the Mother of Constantine's finding at Jerusalem the Cross on which our

<sup>k</sup> ——— Invenit ergo Titulum, REGEM ADORAVIT, non LIGNUM utique, quia hic GENTILIS est ERROR & VANITAS IMPIORUM. Ambros. in Orat. de Obitu Theodosii, T. 3. p. 61. Edit. Erasmi. 1538.

Saviour was crucified; He tells us <sup>k</sup> that upon her finding the Title, (by which she knew our Saviour's Cross from either of the other two) She ADORED the KING of Heaven, not THE WOOD OF THE CROSS, [which would have been in Helena, and in it self] is a PAGANISH ERROR, and the VANITY of the IMPIOUS.

By these words, I question not but St. Ambrose meant that to have Adored the Cross, would have been downright Idolatry: and yet our Compiler hath furnished us (in defence of Image-Worship) with two or three Fathers which are of the opposite Opinion: his St. Asterius Amasenus <sup>l</sup> is so far from thinking it an Impious Vanity to adore the Cross, that He (if we may believe the Romish Writers and the second Synod at Nice, for there is nothing of this Oration in Rubenius's Edition or in the Bibliotheca Patrum of La Bigne) says that Christi-

<sup>l</sup> Nub. Test. p. 163, 164. Nat. Alex. Panopl. Sec. 7. p. 71.

<sup>m</sup> — Apparet Signum [viz. Crucis] Quod ex PRÆSCRIPTO LEGIS Christiani ADORANT. Asterius Orat. de S. Euphemia. in Nubes Testium, p. 164.

ans are COMMANDED by the LAW of GOD to ADORE the CROSS <sup>m</sup>. We are very unhappy that we could never see this Command in the Law; could we but see it, or had St. Ambrose ever dreamt of such a Law, neither He nor we

would



would call *Adoration of the Cross* Idolatry: but this of *Asterius* is too gross and too absurd to deserve a word of answer.

As *Asterius* said the *Adoration of the Cross* was commanded, so *Paulinus Nolanus*, another of our Compiler's Vouchers, assures us <sup>n</sup> that it was practised yearly at Jerusalem, when at every Easter the Bishop of that Church did produce the Cross (on which our Saviour suffered and which was kept by Him) to be *ADORED* by the People; and his third Anthour, <sup>o</sup> *Rusticus Diaconus*, to clear the Point tells us, that the *WHOLE CHURCH* throughout the *WHOLE WORLD* did without any Contradiction or Dispute *ADORE* the *NAILS* <sup>p</sup> with which our Saviour was fastned, as well as the *WOOD* of the *HOLY CROSS* on which He suffered.

<sup>n</sup> *Nubes Testium*, p. 153, 159.  
Nat. Alex. Panopl. Sec. 7. p. 61, 62.

<sup>o</sup> *Nubes Testium*, p. 172.  
Nat. Alex. Panopl. Sec. 7. p. 65.

<sup>p</sup> --- *Clavos & Lignum venerabilis Crucis,*

*Omnis per totum mundum Ecclesia absque ulla contradictione adorat.* <sup>Rust. Diac.</sup> in *Nubes Test.* p. 172.

I question not but every one that reads these passages will admire how things came to be so much altered; or rather, how *St. Ambrose* and this *Paulinus* (who were Contemporaries for some time) should give us such diametrically opposite accounts about the Adoration of the Cross. I will onely desire the Reader (that I may deliver him from his admiration) to observe, that *Paulinus* in this very Epistle tells us, that the place from whence our Saviour ascended into Heaven could never after our Saviour's ascension be paved with Marble or any thing else, but that the Earth threw it all off, and that the footsteps of our Saviour are plainly to be seen there; and (which is a better Story) that though the Bishops of Jerusalem did give an infinite number of the pieces of the Cross to Pilgrims and others, who begged them of those Bishops; yet that the Cross it self is (to put it into our Compiler's translation) nothing at all diminished, but remains as entire as if never touch'd or mangled. I hope this will give the Reader enough of *Paulinus*, whose Epistle I have once read over, but hope in God I never shall again. As for *Rusticus Diaconus*, I will return no other answer than that those who know any thing of the State and Practices of the Church for the first six Centuries, know very well that what *Rusticus* says, is not (to speak softly) the greatest Truth.

Though *Paulinus Nolanus* is not worth the vindicating, yet I cannot but tell our Compiler that he wrongs Him very much,

M

when

¶ Nubes Test.  
p. 165, 167.  
Nat. Alexan.  
Dissert. 6.  
Sec. 8. p. 631.

when He says ¶ after F. Alexandre, that the blessed Trinity was described in Mosaic work in a Church built by this Paulinus: whereas there is no such thing mentioned by Paulinus there in that Epistle, nor ought it, or can it be gathered from the Verses set down by F. Alexandre and our Compiler; since, though the Son might be represented by a Lamb, and the Holy Ghost by a Dove, there was nothing to represent God the Father, except these wise Gentlemen will have him represented by a Voice, which is a little too odd, and a Voice too hard a thing to be painted.

¶ Nub. Test.  
p. 160, 163,  
164, 165,  
172.  
Nat. Alexan.  
Dissert. 6.  
Sec. 8. p. 629.  
630, 631,  
632, 633.

The rest of our Compiler's Testimonies within the first six Centuries prove no more than the use of ¶ Painting in the Churches the Saints and the Martyrs Sufferings, and some Scripture Histories, all which is nothing to the purpose, except he could prove (which he is far from being able to doe) that those that brought those Paints into the Churches were as careful to worship them, as the Church of Rome now is. However, we must inform the Reader, that as this Custom of having Paints and Images in the Churches was without any Command from Scripture, and without any Example of the Church for the golden Ages thereof, the first three hundred years; so neither was it universal, but met with great opposition.

¶ Placuit Pi.  
Euras in Ec-  
clesia esse non  
debere Concil.  
Eliberit. can.  
36. in T. 1.  
Concil. p. 974.

In the beginning of the fourth Century the Council of Illebrivis in Spain commanded that there should be no Pictures in any Church; and the Story of St. Epiphanius in the end of this Century is sufficiently known, who coming by chance into a Church which had a Veil over the door painted with the Picture of our Saviour, or some other Saint, tore it

¶ Cum ergo hoc vidissem in Ecclesia Christi contra Autoritatem Scripturarum hominis pendere Imaginem, scidi illud, &c. Epiphanius. Ep. ad Joann. Episc. Hierosol. apud Hieronymi Opera, Tom. 2. p. 58. Edit. Paris. 1533.

to pieces, and gives this reason for his doing so (in his Letter to the Bishop of Jerusalem) because ¶ it was against Scripture to have the Picture or Image of any person hang in a Christian Church. But afterwards Custom by degrees brought these Pictures into most Churches, and the ignorant people began to worship, and fell to adoring them in the sixth Century; which one of the Bishops of the Church, Serenus of Marseilles, taking

notice of, broke down the Pictures and Images, and cast them out of the Church.

¶ Et quidem Zelum vos, ne quid manu factum adorari possit, habuisse laudavimus, sed frangere

This was taken notice of by Gregory the Great, and though he would not have had him to have broken the Images, yet ¶ he commends his Zeal against their being worshipped. I think his Authority sufficient to end this point of Controversie

troverſe betwixt me and the Compiler : He does in this Epistle fully declare himſelf, that he would have the people kept by all means from giving any worſhip to Images, and recommends onely an Hiſtorical Uſe of them for the Ignorant \* : He is of the ſame mind in his next Epistle to this ſame Biſhop, Serenus ; and though at this day in the Church of Rome Images are ſet up not onely for an Hiſtorical Uſe, but to be worſhipped ; yet I am ſure from his own Pen, that Gregory the Great's Doctrine was, that Images were placed in the Churches for an Hiſtorical Uſe onely, and **NOT TO BE WORSHIPPED** \* : and Gregory concludes his Directions to that Biſhop ; that if any body would have an Image made, He ſhould not hinder it ; but for the paying Adoration to Images, He ſhould by all means hinder and forbid it ; and He adviſes him to admoniſh <sup>7</sup> his Charge, that upon the ſight of thoſe representations they would raiſe up in themſelves ſutable affections, and with humility proſtrate themſelves to, and pay all their Adoration to the **OMNIPOTENT BLESSED TRINITY ALONE**.

*eaſdem Images non debuiſſe judicamus. Greg. M. in Ep. 109. l. 7. Edit. Frob. 1564.*

\* *Tua ergo fraternitas & illuſ ſervare, & ab earum ADORATIONE populum prohibere debuit : Idem, Ibidem.*

\* *Frangi vero non debuit, Quod NON ad ADORANDUM in Eccleſiis, ſed ad inſtruendum SOLUM MODO mentes ſuit Neſcientium collocatum. Idem, Ep. 9. l. 9.*

† *Et ſi quis Images ſacere voluerit, minime prohibe : Adorare vero Images, omnibus modis DEVITA. Sed hoc ſollicitè fraternitas tua admonet, ut ex viſione rei geſta ardorem compunctionis percipiam, & in ADORATIONE SOLIUS OMNIPOTENTIS SANCTÆ TRINITATIS*

*humiliter proſternantur. Idem, Ibidem.*

Such paſſages as this I have juſt mentioned, to which I could add many more out of Antiquity, do ſo much affect me, that I cannot enough wonder at the *Index Expurgatorius* of the preſent Church of Rome \*, which commands *Solus Deus Adorandus* to be ſtruck out of the *Marginal Notes* of Humfredus's Latin Translation and Edition of St. Cyril of Alexandria's Comments upon *Eſaias* † ; and out of the *Marginal Notes* in Robert Stephens Bible printed 1557. *Servendum Soli Deo* ‡ ; whereas both theſe paſſages are the very words of our Saviour himſelf, Matthew 4. 10. I would fain know of any Romaniſt how this is not virtually and in effect to command that that Verſe in the Goſpel ſhould be ſtruck out, though it contains our Saviour's own expreſſions, who ſhould ſurely be allowed

\* *Index Libror. Prohibit. & Expurgandorum, p. 234. Edit. Madrid, 1667.*

† *Cyriſtus ex Verſ. Humfredi Baſil. 1566. p. 258.*

‡ *Index Expurg. p. 99.*

to understand his own Religion as well as the Managers of the *Index Expurgatorius*.

<sup>b</sup> Index Expurg. p. 47. col. 2.

And for what relates to the Cross it self, they have <sup>b</sup> ordered that non ut Adoremus ( not that we should Adore it ) should be struck out of Masius his Learned Commentary upon Joshua 22. 28. These are things so very notorious that my wonder increases, and my admiration at those people, who (notwithstanding all this) would fain have us believe, that they do not worship the Cross it self: when not onely their PONTIFICAL, and their SERVICE on Good-friday, teach and shew that they of the Church of Rome adore the Cross, but their *Index Expurgatorius* is so carefull to strike out of the *Indexes* to the *Fathers Works* any thing that doth but appear to thwart or contradict such worship.

<sup>c</sup> Index Expurg. p. 311.

If the Church of Rome doth not worship Images, why is she so carefull to strike out <sup>c</sup> of the *Index* to St. Hierome such innocent passages as these, Adorare Statuas vel Imagines, Cultores Dei non debent; the Worshippers of God ought not to ADORE Statues or Images; Imago una tantum veneranda, One onely Image, [ to wit, God the Son, the express Image of his Father ] is to be worshipped. Why doth the poor *Index* suffer here, and not St. Hierome in whom <sup>d</sup> these very expressions are?

<sup>a</sup> Nos autem unum habemus virum, & UNAM veneramus Imaginem, qua est invisibilis & omnipotentis Dei. D. Hier. in Ezek. l. 4. c. 16.

& UNAM veneramus Imaginem, qua est invisibilis & omnipotentis Dei. D. Hier. in Ezek.

If the Church of Rome give no Adoration to Saints or Angels, why doth her *Index Expurgatorius* command such passages as these following to be struck out of <sup>e</sup> the *Index* to St. Athanasius's Works, Adorari solius Dei est, nullius autem creatura; Adoration is to be paid to God alone, and to no creature with him; Angeli non sunt Adorandi, Angels are not to be Adored; Creatura nulla adoranda, nulla invocanda, immo eam adorare Arianorum & Ethnicorum sit; No creature is to be adored or invocated, to adore which would be to play the Arian or the Pagan: I would fain know why the *Index* to his Works must be dealt so severely with, while Athanasius himself is guilty (if there be any crime in them) of every expression in the passages which are condemned by the *Index Expurgatorius*.

<sup>e</sup> Index Expurg. p. 52.

Let any one but look into St. Athanasius's third Oration against the Arians, and He may there find this Great Father ( upon occasion of his mentioning St. John's offer to worship the Angel ) speaking out

out <sup>f</sup> plainly enough, that God alone is to be adored, and that the Angels (since they are but Creatures) notwithstanding their Excellencies are in the number of Worshippers, not of the worshipped. In his Epistle to Bishop Adelphius He himself says, ( what the Index to him did but transcribe, ) That we do not adore any Creature ; God forbid ( says the Good Father <sup>g</sup> that we should, since this would be the same sin that the Arians and Pagans are guilty of ; but we do adore the Lord of the Creation, the incarnate Word of God.

Ἄλλων Θε-  
οῦ ἢ ΜΟ-  
ΝΟΤ τὸ  
προσκυνῶν-  
τι τὸ ἴσασ-  
τι ὁππότε οἱ  
Ἀγγελοι· ὅτι  
καὶ ἀλλήλους  
δύξαις ἑα-  
ρῶσι, ἀλλὰ  
κρίσματα

πάντα ἑα-  
στὸν καὶ ἕκαστον τῶν προσκυνῶντων, ἀλλὰ τῷ προσκυνῶντων τὸ Λόγον. D. Athanas.  
Orat. 3. contra Arian. p. 204. Edit. Commel. 1600.

<sup>g</sup> — Οὐ κρίμα προσκυνῶντι, ὡς ῥέετε, ἐδικὸν γὰρ καὶ Ἀριανῶν ἡ πᾶσι πᾶσιν, ἀλλὰ  
τὸ Κύριον τὸ κρίσιμα σκευάζοντα τὸ Θεὸν Ἀΐον προσκυνῶντι. D. Athan. Ep. ad Adelph. p. 331.

If the Church of Rome doth not adore the Martyrs and their Reliques, why doth her Index Expurgatorius strike out of the Index to St. Hierome, Non adorantur Martyres, Martyrs are not to be adored ; Adoramus Solum Deum, honoramus Reliquias Martyrum ; We adore God alone, and honour onely the Reliques of the Martyrs : The Managers of the Index Expurgatorius ought to have considered, that if there be any crime in these passages, St. Hierome himself ought to answer for them, since it was He that said, Christians did not adore the Martyrs <sup>h</sup>, much less their Reliques.

<sup>h</sup> Quis enim,  
O infanum ca-

put aliquando Martyras adoravit, quis hominem putavit Deum, &c. D. Hier. c. Vigilant. T. 2. p. 122.

Either the present Writers of the Church of Rome are not serious and in earnest with us, or they think our eyes shut, and that we do not see some of their Books : it is very vain to talk ( as our Compiler doth ) of respect onely and honour to Saints and their Reliques and Images, when we see that any thing which offers to deny Adoration to all these is condemned by their Authentick earthly Purgatory, the Roman Index.

I will insist no farther on these scandalous things, but hope I may, under the Protection, and after the Example of Gregory the Great, conclude, not onely against Images, ( as <sup>i</sup> He did, ) but <sup>i</sup> Greg. M. against every Creature animate or inanimate, that NO RELIGIOUS WORSHIP is or can be due or given to any of them ; because of that saying of our blessed Saviour : Thou shalt WORSHIP THE LORD THY GOD, and HIM ONELY shalt thou SERVE. Ep. 9. l. 9. Mat. 4. 10.



## CONCLUSION.

**H**AVING now gone through all our *Compiler's Collections*, and answered all his *Testimonies* that were of moment, or came within the first six Centuries, I have nothing left but his *Appendix* upon my hands; but since He owns whence he borrowed this *Appendix*, and all Scholars know how solidly *Bishop Morton* answered the whole of *Brerley's Apology*, I need not trouble my self with answering any little parcels of it; Having answered our *Compiler's Collections* out of the *Fathers themselves*, and shewn that they neither taught nor believed nor practised what our *Compiler* would have them to have done; the *Appendix* is not worth considering; since, if any Protestants did confess that the *Fathers* believed and practised as the Church of Rome now doth, they were mistaken, as hath been sufficiently proved; but if they did not (as I think it were easie to shew) They are abusively brought in here, being Witnesses against, not for, the Church of Rome.

I always lookt upon it so servile a thing to flatter or court a Reader for his good opinion or approbation, that, as I dislike it in our *Compiler's Preface*, so, I am resolv'd to keep it out of my Book as well as *Preface*. All I intreat of the Reader is, that he would read without Prejudice and judge impartially betwixt this Answer and the *Nubes Testinum*; and then, I believe, he will see very good reason for that which I will conclude with, That the *Fathers* of the first five hundred years did neither believe nor practise (in relation to the Points at present under debate) what the Church of Rome at present doth believe and practise.

P O S T-

## P O S T S C R I P T.

HAVING a little room left here, I cannot employ it better, than to take notice of a very great cheat put upon His Sacred Majesty as well as the rest of the Auditours by F. Sabran, in his *Sermon before the King at Chester in August last*: He told his *Auditory*, that he followed the Advice of St. Austin, when he did recommend himself to the most blessed Virgin's Intercession, and did advise them to doe the same: and he quotes for this Saint Austin's 35<sup>th</sup> *Sermon, de Sanctis*; whereas it is confessed by all men of any Learning, that this *Sermon* was not St. Austin's; the very Title of it is sufficient to convince all that know any thing of Antiquity, *Sermo in Festo Assumptionis Mariae*, does not at all agree to any thing that is near St. Austin's time: the *Benedictines of Paris* have cast it into the *Appendix*, as *spurious*, and tell us <sup>a</sup> that in their *Manuscripts* it wants the name of any Author; but the *Divines of Louvain* tell us, that in several MSS. which they used in their Edition of St. Austin <sup>b</sup> this *Sermon, de Sanctis*, was intituled to *Fulbertus Carnotensis*. It is certain it was not writ by St. Austin, or within two hundred years after him, from St. Isidore's being quoted in it, who lived in the beginning of the seventh Century; it is probable that it does belong to *Fulbertus*, who lived not till past a thousand years after Christ: So that I have reason to conclude that F. Sabran was guilty either of great Ignorance or of notorious dissingenuity, who would ascribe to the venerable St. Austin this notorious forgery, and lay that brat to St. Austin, which their own *Divines* do, and cannot but, own to be altogether illegitimate; and therefore F. Sabran, now he cannot but see his great error, ought to undeceive the Members of his Church, that so we may have no more boasting from them of this egregious cheat, as if it were the genuine issue of St. Austin.

*Sermon preached at Chester before the King, August 28. and Printed by Henry Hills.*

<sup>a</sup> In *Præf. Sermon. 208. in Append. Edit. Par. 1683.*  
<sup>b</sup> In *Præf. Sermon. 83. in Append. T. 10. p. 631. Col. Agripp. 1616.*

THE END.

---

Books printed for and sold by *H. Mortlock*, at  
the *Phoenix* in *St. Paul's Church-yard*.

**A** Letter to Mr. G. giving a True Account of the  
Late Conference at the D. of *P.* in *Quarto*.

A second Letter to Mr. G. In Answer to Two Letters  
lately published concerning The Conference at the D.  
of *P.* in *Quarto*.

*VEIERES VINDICATI*, In an Expostulatory  
Letter to Mr. *Sclater* of *Putney*, upon his *Consensus Ve-*  
*terum*, &c. wherein the Absurdity of his method and the  
Weakness of his reasons are shewn : His false Aspersions  
upon the *Church of England* are wiped off, and Her Faith  
concerning the *Eucharist* proved to be that of the Pri-  
mitive Church. Together with Animadversions on Dean  
*Boileau's French* Translation of, and Remarks upon *Ber-*  
*tram*. In *Quarto*.

---

E - PV  
135688-702

REPRODUCED FROM THE ORIGINAL  
IN THE HENRY E. HUNTINGTON  
LIBRARY AND ART GALLERY.  
FOR REFERENCE ONLY.  
PERMISSION NECESSARY FOR  
REPRODUCTION.